PRACE KOMISJI ORJENTALISTYCZNEJ POLSKIEJ AKADEMJI UMIEJĘTNOŚCI NR. 2.

MÉMOIRES DE LA COMMISSION ORIENTALE DE L'ACADÉMIE POLONAISE DES SCIENCES ET DES LETTRES.

ANDRZEJ GAWROŃSKI

STUDIES ABOUT THE SANSKRIT BUDDHIST LITERATURE

W KRAKOWIE

NAKŁADEM AKADEMJI UMIEJĘTNOŚCI

SKŁAD GŁÓWNY W KSIĘGARNI G. GEBETHNERA I SP. W KRAKOWIE

GEBETHNERA I WOLFFA W WARSZAWIE

1919

CONTENTS.

Addition to p. 52 ll. 10 foll.

While discussing the possible relation of Divyāv. 352, 2—3 to Saund. IV, 6 I have overlooked that a similar phrase is found in the Lalitavistara 59, 19 viz. *rājñā cāpi Śuddhōdanēna manuṣyātikrāntaṁ divy[illegible] prāptam gṛhataraṁ* (query °*varaṁ?*) *pratisaṁskāritaṁ abhūt.* But the Divyāvadāna (just as the Sāundarananda) speak of a human being, not of a palace.

I. Further Notes on the Buddhacarita.

The present article forms a sequel to what I published on the same subject in the first volume of the Polish Archives of Oriental Research, three years ago. The notes I venture to present to the reader were mostly taken in the year 1915 when I was busy in bringing about the MS (long since ready for print) for a revised edition of the Buddhacarita. Whoever thinks we had better refrain from such conjectural emendation and critical examination of ancient texts, may condemn my work as superfluous. For my part I subscribe to Böhtlingk's opinion that it is „für die Wissenschaft erspriesslicher, schon gedruckte Werke, die dem Inhalt oder der Sprache nach Beachtung verdienen, zu sichten und zu verbessern, als neuere Erzeugnisse von fraglichem Werte zu veröffentlichen". Now, the Buddhacarita certainly deserves consideration in the utmost degree.

Canto I.

3d. *saṁbhāvanāṁ vā saphalīcakāra* ||

Cp. *avi ṇāma amhāṇaṁ saṁbhāvaṇā saphalā havē*, Mālavikāgnimitra ed. Bollensen, p. 44, 1.

31a. *dīptyā ca dhairyēṇa śriyā rarāja*

śriyā spoils the metre lengthening as it does the last syllable of the preceding word. The true reading viz. *rarāja lakṣmyā* has been preserved in A, one of Mr. Joglekar's MSS. *śriyā* is probably due to a gloss. Is it not somewhat strange that an evident metrical

blunder should have passed unnoticed by so many critics, European and Indian alike (my own humble self among others)? I don't stand upon trifles but this is certainly a case that bears no testimony in favour of our real intimacy with Sanskrit poetry.

93. *bhavanam atha vigāhya Śākyarājō*
Bhava iva Ṣaṇmukhajanmanā pratītaḥ |
idam idam iti harṣapūrṇavaktrō
bahuvidhapuṣṭiyaśaskaraṁ vyadhatta ||

A commentary on the somewhat obscure words *idam idam iti* is afforded by the following passage of the Kādambarī: „*tatra ca dviguṇitakuthāsanōpaviṣṭaḥ samīpōpaviṣṭēna tadguṇōpavarṇanaparēṇa Vāiśampāyanēna yathārhaṁ bhūmibhāgōpavēśitēna rājaputralōkēna 'idam asmāi dīyatām, idam asmāi dīyatām' iti prasādaviśēṣadarśanasaṁvardhitasēvārasēna ca sahāhāravidhim akarōt*". (ed. Bombay, Nirṇaya Sāgara Press[4] 1912, p. 191).

94. *iti narapatiputrajanmavṛddhyā*
sajanāpadaṁ Kapilāhvayaṁ puraṁ tat |
Dhanadapuram ivāpsarō'vakīrṇaṁ
muditam abhūn Nalakūbaraprasūtāu ||

°*vṛddhyā* in the first pāda must strike one as quite out of place in this connexion. I think it is simply due to a slip of the pen and stands for °*buddhyā* which yields an excellent meaning and is far more natural. Cp. *athō nimittāiś ca tapōbalāc ca taj janma janmāntakarasya buddhvā*, 54 ab. The same mistake in wr[illegible]g — or in spelling if one likes better to put it so — recurs in II 25d where Mr. Nandargikar's text has *buddhi*° for *vṛddhi*° of all other MSS and editions. *u* for *ṛ* and inversely are of no rare occurrence in Sanskrit MSS. See e. g. IV 101c (*viniguhya* Cowell, Nandargikar, *vinigṛhya* Joglekar), V 86c (*akuruta* Cowell, Nandargikar, *akṛṣata* Joglekar), VI 67b (*upaguhya* CD, *upagṛhya* P). Cp. also my notes on IV 40 and 101, infra. — By the bye, this is a clear evidence that already the common source of the existing MSS of our poem contained errors.

Canto II.

7c. *vināśmavarṣāśanipātadōṣāiḥ*

That I was right in proposing to read °*ghōṣāiḥ* for °*dōṣāiḥ* is shown by the various reading of H (one of Mr. Joglekar's MSS) ad V 25a viz. *mahābhradōṣaḥ* for *mahābhraghōṣaḥ* of all other MSS.

10c. *abhyarthitaḥ sūkṣmadhanō 'pi cāyam*

cāitat (standing in correlation to *yat* a) instead of *cāyam* seems to show the best way out of the difficulties of this stanza.

11. *nāśō vadhō bandhuṣu nāpy adātā*
nāivāvratō nānṛtikō na hiṁsraḥ |
āsīt tadā kaścana tasya rājyē
rājñō Yayātēr iva Nāhuṣasya ||

nāśō vadhō a is the reading of P; CD as well as Mr. Nandargikar's MS have *nāsāuvadhō* which has been explained by Prof. Leumann as a derivative of *svadhā*. Mr. Joglekar's edition reads: *dvēṣyō 'nṛjur bandhuṣu* which is manifestly corrupt. Other proposed corrections are: *nāsāuhṛdō* (Böhtlingk), *nāśēvadhir* (? Kern), *nāgāuravō* (Kielhorn), *nāśāucadhō* (Formichi). Now, the whole passage to which our stanza belongs has got a close parallel in a similar passage of the Rāmāyaṇa where a picture of Daśaratha's happy reign is given. The following six ślōkas deserve to be quoted in full:

kāmī vā na kadaryō vā nṛśaṁsaḥ puruṣaḥ kvacit |
draṣṭuṁ śakyam Ayōdhyāyāṁ nāvidvān na ca nāstikaḥ || 8 ||
nāmṛṣṭabhōjī nādātā nāpy anaṅgadantṣkadhṛk |
nāhastābharaṇō vāpi dṛśyatē nāpy anātmavān || 11 ||
nānāhitāgnir nāyajvā na kṣudrō vā na taskaraḥ |
kaścid āsīd Ayōdhyāyāṁ na cāvṛttō na saṁkaraḥ || 12 ||
svakarmaniratā nityaṁ brāhmaṇā vijitēndriyāḥ |
dānādhyāyanaśīlāś ca saṁyatāś ca pratigrahē || 13 ||
nāstikō nānṛtī vāpi na kaścid abahuśrutaḥ |
nāsūyakō na cāśaktō nāvidvān vidyatē kvacit. || 14 ||

nāṣaḍaṅgavid atrāsti nāvratō nābahuśrutaḥ |
na dīnaḥ kṣiptacittō vā vyathitō vāpi kaścana || 15 ||
(Rāmāyaṇa I 6, 8. 11—15).

A comparison of the two passages shows that every epithet used by Aśvaghōṣa has got an exact parallel in the Rāmāyaṇa. Cp. *adātṛ* BC and *adātṛ* Rām. 11a, *avrata* BC and *avratin* Rām. 15b, *anṛtika* BC and *anṛtin* Rām. 14a. For *hiṁsra* BC we find its synonyms viz. *nṛśaṁsa* Rām. 8b and *taskara* 12b. The influence of the earlier poet on the later one is beyond doubt, though of course the author of the Rāmāyaṇa being more profuse of words his description is more redundant than that of Aśvaghōṣa. But style does not matter. It is importing to notice that no epithet used by the Buddhist poet is wanting in the older poem. Now, should *nāśō vadhō* alone break the chain of parallels? I should not think. But what ought it to be changed to? Well, we have the choice between correcting it to *nāsūyakō* Rām. 14c or adopting the somewhat disputable ἅπαξ λεγόμενον *nāsāuvadhō* which would perhaps corresponds to *nāyajvā* 12a. Personally I am rather inclined to decide in favour of the first form, *nāsūyakō* being better suited to *bandhuṣu* than *nāsāuvadhō*. But the question is still open. It may be added that the influence of Rāmāyaṇa on our passage is rendered doubly sure by the fact that another line of Aśvaghōṣa's, very closely following our stanza (II 11 and II 15), has been elucidated with the help of a parallel ślōka of Vālmīki's. (See my former article on the Buddhacarita, Polish Archives of Oriental Research, Vol. I, ad locum).

21. 22. — We have a set of nominatives here, not of accusatives as I have assumed in my former article. *ācakrirē* is therefore passive.

42cd. *babandha sāntvēna phalēna cāitāṁs*
tyāgō hi tēṣām anupāyadṛṣṭaḥ ||

My translation of these two pādas (Archives I, ad locum) can be corroborated by a similar line met with in a nearly contemporary poet, viz.

iyaṁ tu pūjā mama daṇḍadhāriṇaḥ
kṛtāparādhasya hi satkṛtir vadhaḥ ||
(Bhāsa, Pratijñāyāugandharāyaṇa IV v. 23cd.).

46cd. *Śuddhōdanē Rāhusapatnavaktrō*
jajñē sutō Rāhula ēva nāmnā ||

„Anscheinend denkt sich der dichter *Rāhula* als compositum mit *-la* „nehmend" (im sinne von *-hara*) da ohne eine solche voraussetzung die vergleichung Rāhula's mit dem Rāhu-sapatna sich wie ableitung von *lucus a non lucendo* ausnehmen würde". This remark of Prof. Leumann's is quite right, but he should have said 'selbstverständlich' instead of 'wahrscheinlich'. The popular etymology mentioned by the learned professor has passed current in India and is borne out by several exemples. Cp. f. i.:

Sīhabāhu narindo so sīhaṁ ādinnavā iti |
Sīhalo tena sambandhā ete sabbe pi Sīhalā ||
(Mahāvaṁsa VII 42).

'That king Sīhabāhu has been called Sīhala on account of his having torn asunder a lion'.[1]) But I must beg the reader's pardon for a short digression which does not appear misplaced in this connexion. One of the legends of the Divyāvadāna explains the proper noun *Siṁhala*, which is the same as Pāli *Sīhala*, in a different way. The passage in question runs as follows: *ayaṁ dārakaḥ Siṁhasya sārthavāhasya putrō bhavatu Siṁhala iti nāma tasya Siṁhala iti nāmadhēyaṁ vyavasthāpitam*[2]). It appears from this as well as from one or two similar passages[3]) that the taddhita suffix *-la*

---

[1]) Even modern writers are not loath to repeat such etymologies. Cp. the following passage from Paṇḍit Jībānanda Vidyāsāgara's commentary on the Mudrārākṣasa: *vṛṣalam* | *vṛṣaṁ dharmaṁ lāti nāśayatīti vṛṣalaḥ śūdraḥ* (Mudrārākṣasa ed. by J. V., 4-th edition by A. B. Vidyābhūṣaṇa & N. B. Vidyāratna, Calcutta 1911 p. 11, 6).

[2]) Divyāvadāna ed. Cowell and Neil, p. 523.

[3]) *ayaṁ dārakō Bhavasya gṛhapatēḥ putraḥ tasmād bhavatu Bhavila iti nāmadhēyaṁ vyavasthāpitam.* (ibid. p. 24). Cp. also: *ayaṁ dārakaḥ Priyasēnasya sārthavāhasya putras tad bhavatu dārakasya nāma Supriya iti.* (ib. p. 99). A Buddhist nun surnamed *Ṛddhilamātā* (cp. *Rāhulamātā*) is mentioned Divyāv. p. 160. Other i. e. not patronymic names ending in *-la* are of course likewise possible.

was felt as forming or was even used to form patronymic proper nouns (cp. also *mātula* from *mātṛ*). Now, Śuddhōdana and his progeny looked on Raghu as one of their most prominent ancestors. Is it too bold to assume that *Rāhula* — which appears to be a middle Indian form — corresponds to Sanskrit **Raghula* and means virtually the same as *Raghunandana, Rāghava* etc.?

Canto III.

8c.

(tataḥ sa jāmbūnadabhāṇḍabhṛdbhir
yuktaṁ caturbhir nibhṛtāis turaṅgāiḥ |)
aklībavidyucchuciraśmidhāraṁ
(hiraṇmayaṁ syandanam ārurōha ||)

There is also a variant viz. *aklīvavidhyacchuci°* P. The long compound filling the third pāda of the stanza quoted above has given rise to a difference of opinion as to what should be its correct rendering. No doubt, it is grammatically possible to take *aklība* as referring to *raśmidhāra* and *vidyucchuci* as qualifying *raśmi*. This is the explanation of this word given by Böhtlingk. But it is only fair to acknowledge that it is hurting the stylistical point of view. The compound has a clumsy appearance. No wonder that Cowell preferred to construe *aklība* with *vidyut*. He is followed by the Indian interpretors. But again, lightnings can hardly be called 'manly'. It would be most natural to analyze the compound as an ordinary karmadhāraya-bahuvrīhi, *aklība vidyut(?)* and *śuci* (or *vidyucchuci?*) being epithets of the charioteer. Of course, *vidyut* which looks very suspicious and cannot be explained in a satisfactory manner, must be corrupt. But what shall we have to put in its stead? Well, there is a passage in the Jātakamālā which along with the various reading of the Paris MS enables us to remove all difficulties by restoring the original wording of the text. The general situation is nearly the same. We are told in a legend, intitulated Ayōgṛhajātaka, how Bōdhisattva, then a young prince, decided to make a tour through his father's capital. Having got the king's permission he mounted his splendid car with four horses of state put to it and drove out into the richly adorned streets.

But growing disappointed by the wanton display of mirth and splendour he began to ponder over the light-heartedness — not to say light-headedness — of men who shrink not from making merry in the face of imminent death. The influence of the olden legend of prince Siddhārtha on this portion of the story is undeniable. But I think we must go even further and assume a direct influence of the Buddhacarita on Ārya-Śūra. The whole passage of the jātaka that can interest us being unfortunately too long to be repeated in full, we must content ourselves with quoting the few words that can help us to restore the genuine text of the stanza in question. They are found on p. 226 ll. 12—13 of Kern's edition and read as follows: *hāimabhāṇḍābhyalaṁkṛtavinītacaturaturaṅgaṁ dakṣadākṣiṇyanipuṇaśucivinītadhīrasārathiṁ citrōjjvalavēṣapraharaṇāvaraṇānuyātraṁ rathavaram adhiruhya.* The first compound corresponds to III 8 ab of our poem. The last pāda of our stanza corresponding to *rathavaram adhiruhya* as well as to the preceding epithet of the chariot, there remains the long compound *dakṣa°* — *°sārathim* as the equivalent of our third pāda. It is worth noticing that the correspondence of the two passages is nearly perfect. Considering the remarkable parallelism of the general situation, the direct influence of Aśvaghōṣa on the later poet seems out of question [1]). Now the compound *dakṣadākṣiṇyanipuṇaśucivinītadhīrasārathim* is a bahuvrīhi the first of the two members of which is a long dvandva made up of two adjectives. There is every reason to believe that *aklībavidyucchuciraśmidhāram* is every bit a similar compound. In fact, *śuci* is common to both of them, *aklība* has got its exact correlate in *dhīra*, which is synonymous with it. But what of *vidyut?* Of course it can mean nothing. The

[1]) In one of the later stanzas of the same jātaka (No. XXXII) we find the following assertion:

na manyunā snēhaparikṣayēṇa vā |
prayāmi dharmāya tu niścitō vanaṁ ||
(v. 41 cd).

This is clearly a reminiscence from Buddhacarita XI 15:

jarāmaraṇanāśārthaṁ praviṣṭō 'smi tapōvanam |
na khalu svargatarṣēṇa nāsnēhēna na manyunā ||

true reading has been preserved under a slight disguise in the seemingly meaningless *vidhyat* (no present participle from *vyadh!*) of P which ought to be corrected to *vidvat*, thus being made to agree with *dakṣa* and *dākṣiṇyanipuṇa*. *vinīta* is either an independent addition of the later poet or else it is due to a slip of the copyist's pen having crept into our compound from the preceding one. For my part, I am rather inclined to cancel it, there being indeed very little probability that Ārya-Śūra, a picked stylist if there ever had been any in India, should have applied the same epithet first to horses and then, in the next following compound, to the charioteer. So then I don't hesitate to read in the Buddhacarita: *aklībavidvacchuciraśmidhāram*. The emendation is pretty sure.

33d. *(ēvaṁ jarāṁ rūpavināśayitrīṁ)*
jānāti cāivēcchati cāiṣa lōkaḥ ||

jānāti cāivēcchati cāiva is certainly more natural. *lōka* answers here to 'people'. There is no reason to insist upon it. *ēṣa* for *ēva* (and inversely) is pretty often met with. The MSS of our poem are not distinguished for any particular correctness with respect to this point.

Canto IV.

25cd. *cakrur ākṣēpikāś cēṣṭā bhītabhītā ivāṅganāḥ* ||

Prof. Lüders' correction viz. *bhītābhītā* 'furchtsam und doch wieder nicht furchtsam also schüchtern' is superfluous, since *bhītabhīta* alone can be taken to mean 'schüchtern'. Cp. the following stanza:

māninījanavilōcanapātān
uṣṇabāṣpakaluṣān pratigṛhṇan |
mandamandamuditaḥ prayayāu khaṁ
bhītabhīta iva śītamayūkhaḥ ||
(Kirātārjunīya, IX 26).

This has been translated by Prof. Cappeller as follows: 'Die durch heisse Tränen getrübten Blicke der schmollenden Frauen entgegennehmend, stieg der aufgegangene Mond langsam und gleichsam

schüchtern in die Luft empor'. (HOS vol. XV. Cambridge Mass. 1912). Here, the situation admits of no other rendering.

39b. *(pīnavalgustanī kācid) vātāghūrṇitakuṇḍalā |*
(uccāir avajahāsāinaṁ samāpnōtu bhavān iti ||

I greatly doubt whether Cowell's *vātā°* has really hit on the genuine reading in spite of its being supported by the testimony of Mr. Nandargikar's MS. Other MSS read *vāsā°* CD and *vāsya°* P. Mr. Joglekar's edition has what appears to be a gloss on our text viz. *līlācañcalakuṇḍalā* [1]). Well, I think we need no further help to restore the original wording of the line. It must have run *lāsāghūrṇitakuṇḍalā* or perhaps *lāsyā°* i. e. 'with her ear-rings whirling about in (or through) sportive dance': This epithet helps us to understand the whole stanza: 'Catch me if you can! exclaimed mockingly another girl, rotating in merry dance till her ear-rings whirled around'. No object is needed (*mām āpnōtu*, Böhtlingk) it being sufficiently accounted for by the situation.

40d. *(apayāntaṁ tathāivānyā babandhur mālyadāmabhiḥ |*
kāścit sākṣēpamadhurāir) jagṛhur vacanāṅkuśāiḥ ||

jagṛhur cannot be possibly right. But neither can my former suggestions (*jaghnus tu* etc.) claim to be anything more than mere guesses. And yet the true reading was very near at hand. *jagṛhur* ought to be changed to *jagarhur.* The correctness of this emendation is proved (1) by the various readings ad IV 101c viz. *vinigarhya* and *vinigṛhya* (besides *viniguhya*, see infra, ad locum); (2) by the following ślōka:

gṛhē gṛhē rudatyaś ca bhartāraṁ gṛham āgatam |
vyagarhayanta duḥkhārtā vāgbhis tōtrāir iva dvipān ||
(Rāmāyaṇa II, 48, 6).

59. *jarāṁ mṛtyuṁ ca vyādhiṁ ca kō hi jānan sacētanaḥ |*
svasthas tiṣṭhēn niṣīdēd vā svapēd vā kiṁ punar hasēt ||

The 3. sing. pot. *svapēt* d which is sneered at by partisans of clas-

[1]) Cp. a pretty similar case discussed in my note to V 58d. (Polish Archives I).

sical Sanskrit had stuck to our ślōka in India. The stanza is quoted in a somewhat modified form by Ballāla:

> *jarāṁ mṛtyuṁ bhayaṁ vyādhiṁ yō jānāti sa paṇḍitaḥ |*
> *svasthas tiṣṭhēn niṣīdēd vā svapēd vā kēna cid dhasēt ||*
> (Bhōjaprabandha ed. Bombay 1913, v. 36).

The second pāda of this is a standing phrase borrowed from other similar gnomes; of course, it breaks the syntactical unity of the whole. Ballāla seems to know nothing about the origin of the ślōka he incorporated into his collection of stories as he attributes it to an anonymous brother of Vatsarāja, a contemporary of Bhōja's. Herr Oster, too, has failed to discover the source of our stanza [1].

101c. *sva ēva bhāvē viniguhya manmatham*

viniguhya is found in Cowell's (MSS=) edition as well as in that of Mr. Nandargikar. The Tibetan translation as communicated by Wenzel seems to have read *vinigarhya*. This reading — which no doubt is the genuine one — is also noticed in margin of Mr. Nandangikar's MS. Mr. Joglekar reads *vinigṛhya*. Indeed, *ar ṛ* and *u* are often liable to be substituted for one another. Of course, *mṛta* cannot become *muta*, nor, say, *suta* — *sarta*. But wherever a possibility of substitution is given i. e. wherever the various reading thus arising is an intelligible word, we are bound to examine the case. Thus °*buddhyā* I 94a has proved far better than °*vṛddhyā* and *jagarhuḥ* IV 40d had to be preferred to *jagṛhuḥ* although the evidence of the MSS was in favour of the latter forms.

102a. *tataḥ purōdyānagatāṁ janaśriyaṁ*
(nirīkṣya sāyaṁ pratisaṁhṛtāṁ punaḥ |
anityatāṁ sarvagatāṁ vicintayan
vivēśa dhiṣṇyaṁ kṣitipālakātmajaḥ ||)

CDP read *janastriyaṁ*, an impossible word; *janaśriyaṁ* which has been conjectured by Cowell is also the reading of the both Indian

[1] L. Oster, Die Rezensionen des Bhojaprabandha. Diss. Darmstadt 1911, pag. 29.

editions. *jana-*, the first member of this compound, yielding no good sense, Prof. Lüders suggested to correct the whole into *purōdyānagatāṅganāśriyam.* I cannot agree with him. Female beauty does not 'withdraw again in the evening'. On the contrary, artificial light serves rather to enhance it. But not so the beauty of a garden, displayed afresh every morning to disappear anon and anon every evening. So I think we must read *vanaśriyam.* Indeed, the correction lies close at hand. *j* for *v* cannot appear strange. Cp. my note to IX 35c, infra, where the substitution of *v* for *j* is stated. *vanaśrī* is a common compound, very aptly used in connexion with a town-park.

Canto V.

15a. *na jaharṣa na cāpi cānutēpē*

I should like to read *na cāpi vā.* But of course the reading of the text, though no doubt very clumsy, can be defended. Should we compare *ta ēva cāivāuṣadhayaḥ* II 8c?

24b. *(sukhitā bata nirvṛtā ca sā strī)*
patir īdṛk tvam ivāyatākṣa yasyāḥ |
(iti taṁ samudīkṣya rājakanyā
praviśantaṁ pathi sāñjalir jagāda || *)*

Cowell's MSS as well as Mr. Nandargikar's edition read *iha* for *iva* which, however, is supported by Mr. Joglekar's edition and by a marginal note in Mr. Nandargikar's MS.[1]) There can be no doubt that *iha* ought to be preferred. It is prince Siddhārtha's wife, Yaśōdharā, whom the young maiden calls happy, not any woman having a husband like him. Moreover it is *iha* not *iva* which agrees with the *ayaṁ* of the Pāli version of our stanza as quoted in the Nidānakathā viz.

[1]) It should be borne in mind, as I have shown in my former article on the Buddhacarita (Archives p. 4), that such marginal notes result in part from a collation of Bt with a printed copy of Cowell's edition.

nibbutā bata sā nārī yassāyaṁ īdiso pati.

Cp. also III 23c: *dhanyāsya bhāryēti śanāir avōcan.*

56c. *savilāsa r a t ā n t a t ā n t a m ūrvōr*
(vivarē kāntam ivābhinīya śiśyē ||)

The same anuprāsa is met with in a stanza of Amaru: *s u r a-t ā n t a t ā n t a nayanaṁ vaktram* (v. 3c ed. Durgāprasāda & Parab[2], Bombay 1900).

62b. *(iti sattvakulānurūparūpaṁ)*
vividhaṁ sa pramadājanaḥ śayānaḥ |
(sarasaḥ sadṛśaṁ babhāra rūpaṁ
pavanāvarjitarugṇapuṣkarasya ||)

śayānaḥ is certainly wrong. It gives the construction of ab a clumsy turn, the second member of the adverbial compound in a viz. *-rūpam* being difficult to account for and appearing rather superfluous. This must have been felt instinctively by the copyist of the common source of Cowell's MSS, as he omitted the second *rūpa* thus shortening the line of two syllables (*°kulānurūpa* P, *°kulānurūpaṁ* CD). I think we ought to correct *śayānaḥ* into *dadhānaḥ* which not only makes appear the use of *-rūpam* very appropriate (the compound being now a substantive), but, moreover, restores the natural parallelism between ab and cd, *°rūpaṁ dadhānaḥ* answering exactly to *babhāra rūpam.* The substitution of *śayānaḥ* for the genuine reading is sufficiently accounted for by its frequent employment throughout the whole description.

69. *hṛdi yā mama tuṣṭir adya jātā*
vyavasāyaś ca yathā dhṛtāu niviṣṭaḥ |
vijanē 'pi ca nāthavān ivāsmi
dhruvam arthō 'bhimukhaḥ sa mē ya iṣṭaḥ ||

iva c ought to be changed to *yathā* in agreement with *yā* a and *yathā* b. Relative clauses of this type are a favourite construction with the author of the Buddhacarita. Cp. VII 57, XIII 59. Sāund. - N. VI 47c. A look at them will teach us that there is no room for any intermediate remarks between the antecedent and the conclusive sentence. On the contrary the protasis is immediately followed by the apodosis.

This rule is observed by other poets too [1]). Besides, *iva* is out of place in our stanza. Siddhārtha speaks under immediate impression of the assistance lent him by the celestials. He feels really *nāthavān*, not only 'as it were'. Hence his deep conviction: I'm sure I'll attain the object of my desires.

75cd. *aham apy amṛtaṁ paraṁ yathāvat*
turagaśrēṣṭha labhēya tat kuruṣva ||

yathāvat being of course impossible Speyer proposed to read *yathā yat* instead of it. I think *yathā tat* is more natural. Construe: *tat kuruṣva yathāhaṁ tat param amṛtaṁ labhēya* (viz. that highest amṛta which I am continually striving at, which is the sole object of my desires, which you cannot fail to appreciate at its full worth etc. etc.).

81a. *kanakavalayabhūṣitaprakōṣṭhāiḥ*

Cp. *kanakavalayabhraṁśariktaprakōṣṭhaḥ*, Mēghadūta 2b.

84. *atha sa vikacapaṅkajāyatākṣaḥ*
puram avalōkya nanāda siṁhanādam |
jananamaraṇayōr adṛṣṭapārō
na punar ahaṁ Kapilāhvayaṁ pravēṣṭā ||

Read *punar* for *puram* b and vice versa *puram* for *punar* d. — *Kapilāhvayaṁ* cannot stand alone for Kapilavāstu. Cp. *Kapilāhvayaṁ puram* I 94 b and VIII 5 a. See also my note to VIII 33, infra.

Canto VII.

19c. *adṛṣṭatattvō 'pi na saṁtutōṣa*

Here too, as elsewhere, *'pi* stands falsely for *hi*. Siddhārtha is not

[1]) Cp. e. g. Rāmāyaṇa II, 14, 14:

yas tē mantrakṛtaḥ pāṇir agnāu pāpē, mayā dhṛtaḥ |
saṁtyajāmi svajaṁ cāiva tava putraṁ saha tvayā ||

But the construction is seldom met with in Sanskrit literature.

discomfited although he has caught no glimpse of truth in the hermit's exposition of the tapas doctrine but just because of it.

21cd. *tē viprayuktāḥ khalu gantukāmā*
mahattaraṁ bandhanam ēva bhūyaḥ ||

While restoring in a brilliant manner the second pāda, Kielhorn has failed to notice the slight mistake in writing which disfigures the first one. The verb *viprayuj* is not suited to *bandhana.* Read *vipramuktāḥ* and cp. e. g. *viṣayagatāni vimucya bandhanāni* I 87 b, *andhāya yaś ca spṛhayēd anandhō baddhāya muktō* etc. XI 53 ab; *vipramukta* is said elsewhere of arrows discharged from the bow (XIII 15 a, 47 a), *viprayōga* denotes only the idea of separation from one's family and the like (VI 46, 47).

33. *abhyuddhṛtaprajvalitāgnihōtraṁ*
kṛtābhiṣēkarṣijanāvakīrṇam |
jāpyasvanākūjitadēvakōṣṭhaṁ
dharmasya karmāntam iva pravṛttam ||

I doubt whether any reader of this can be really satisfied with the literal sense of *karmānta* = *karmaṇō 'ntaḥ.* On the other hand I have always been struck by the ambiguity of the compounds *abhyuddhṛtaprajvalita, kṛtābhiṣēka* and *svanākūjita.* Well, to cut it short, I surmise that *karmānta* has the meaning of 'forge, smithy'. Cp. *karmāra.* At once, new light is shed on the whole stanza, which acquires the character of an artificially elaborated simile. Translation and commentary: 'It (scil. the penance-grove) appeared like a forge of dharma in full activity: glowing agnihōtras were being accumulated in it (as red-hot iron or perhaps incandescent hammers is or are brandished in a forge), it was full of holy ascetics who were performing their ablutions (as a forge is full of red-hot iron which is being sprinkled with water) and its chapels resounded with the murmur of prayers (as a forge resounds with the din of hammering)'. Cp. I 10.

In my explanation of the above, I am confirmed by a line of the Mṛcchakaṭika which runs as follows:

(kim yāty asya puraḥ śanāiḥ pravahaṇaṁ tasyāntaraṁ mārgatē)
(bhagnē 'kṣē parivartanaṁ prakurutē chinnō 'thavā pragrahaḥ |)

karmāntōtthitadāruvāritagatir mārgāntaram yācatē
(svāiram prēritagōyugaḥ kim athavā svacchandam āgacchati ||)
(ed. Stenzler p. 107 l. 15)

karmāntōjjhita°, *karmāntōjita°*, *vartmāntōjjhita°* and one or two other corrupted readings are found in the MSS. The first of these variants viz. *karmāntōjjhita°* has been followed by Böhtlingk who translated 'Oder hemmt ein bei der Arbeit liegen gebliebener Balken die Fahrt, so dass er einen anderen Weg suchen muss?' Mr. Godbole preferred to adopt *vartmantōjjhita°* which is evidently a spurious reading, rather awkwardly explained by Lalladīkṣita as *vartmanaḥ margasya antē madhyē (!) ujjhitēna tyaktēna* [1]). Now, there can be no doubt that Stenzler's reading is genuine. It is clearly the lectio difficilior and, moreover, occurs in an excellent MS. Other variants quoted above must be recognised as later corruptions or rather palpable attempts at correcting the original wording grown unintelligible to copyists and commentators. All these difficulties are done away with if we assign to *karmānta* the meaning of 'smithy' or perhaps the larger sense of 'workshop' or the like. The whole line should be translated: 'He is perhaps trying to clear his way *(antaram !antaram!)* being checked in his advance by a rafter protruding from a smithy (or: a workinghouse)'. The technical meaning of *karmanta* having fallen into desuetude was soon forgotten, the few passages where our word occurred being taken to contain a regular tatpuruṣa compound. But a last glimpse of the true acceptation of *karmānta* is found in Pṛthvīdhara's commentary on it viz.: *karmāntō rājādīnām niyōgaviśēṣaḥ*. This is not much, to be sure, but at any rate it shows that *karmānta*, though banned from the recognised vocabulary was still felt to purport more than 'the end of the work'.

43ab. *imē hi vāñchanti tapaḥsahāyam*
tapōnidhānapratimam bhavantam |

---

[1]) Followed by Regnaud who says: 'ou bien son chemin était obstrué par une pièce de bois qui se trouvait au milieu' (!). I have no other translation at hand save that of Kellner of which, however, we do not need here to take account.

I read *tapōnidhā apratimaṁ* b. *imē* alone, without a substantive, can hardly satisfy as the preceding stanzas do not speak of ascetics to whom the pronoun could refer. Moreover, the prince can scarcely be called *tapōnidhānapratima* as he never yet practised penance. Finally, it is rather better style if the same term (here *tapas*) repeated in what is called the anuprāsa manner is not found in two coordinate words. To quote but one example: *tam arcayitvā vidhivad vidhijñaṁ tapōdhanaṁ mānadhanāgrayāyī*, Raghuvaṁśa V 3 ab. But of course this cannot be a general rule.

57c. *(gambhīratā yā bhavatas tv agādhā*
yā dīptatā yāni ca lakṣaṇāni |)
ācāryakaṁ prāpsyati tat pṛthivyāṁ
(yan na ṛṣibhiḥ pūrvayugē 'py avāptam ||)

prāpsyati can refer neither to the nominatives in ab (as it is the prince himself who shall become the Teacher) nor to *bhavatas* (as it would make the construction too loose). The genuine reading is most probably *prāpsyasi*. Cp. my note to VI 69, supra.

Canto VIII.

7c. *(tatō bhramadbhir diśi dīnamānasāir*
anujjvalāir bāṣpahatēkṣaṇāir janāiḥ |)
nivāryamāṇāv iva tāv ubhāu puraṁ
(śanāi rajaḥsnātam ivābhijagmatuḥ ||)

Read: *nivāryamāṇāv api*. Of course, Chandaka must have been stopped every now and then by men desirous to learn what misfortune has befallen prince Siddhārtha. The following stanzas show that the inhabitants of Kapilavāstu did no justice to the stoical device: no news is good news. But Chandaka was too much grieved to be communicative. He did not heed the passers-by who troubled him with questions and he would not speak till he saw himself surrounded by the entire town-folk. Te be sure *api* is the only particle which answers for the situation; *iva* is sufficiently accounted for by its appearing in the next pāda. It has been written anticipatively, as is often the case, by a careless copyist.

29ab. *karaprahārapracalāiś ca tā babhur*
yathāpi nāryaḥ sahitōnnatāiḥ stanāiḥ |

yathāpi cannot be possibly good. *vṛthāpi* (Böhtlingk) and *tathāpi* (Formichi) have been proposed instead of it. I should like to read *babhus tathā hi.*

31d. (*uvāca niḥśvāsacalatpayōdharā*)
vigāḍhaśōkāśrudharā Yaśōdharā ||

vigāḍha° (Cowell, foot-note; Böhtlingk) is only a miscarried conjecture. Now, *śōkāśru* is no doubt a very unusual word. One is rather wont to say either *śōkāmbu* or *aśru.* On the other hand, *ambudhara* is a very common compound and the feminine *ambudharā* may very well stand for *ambudhārā jaladhārā* or a similar word meaning 'river'. The whole can be taken to be a bahuvrīhi and to mean: '(having a river i. e.) floating or submerging in a deep river of tears'. As a tatpuruṣa compound it can be analyzed: *vigādhaṁ śōkāmbu aśru dhārayatīti vā.* But the first explanation is preferable because of the epithet *vigādha.* Cp. *śōkāmbhasi tatprabhavē hy agādhē duḥkhārṇavē majjati Śākyarājaḥ*, IX 24ab.

57cd. *pradātum evābhyucitō na yācituṁ*
kathaṁ sa bhikṣāṁ parataś cariṣyati ||

This idea has been imitated by Ārya-Śūra: *atha sa rājā pradānasamucitatvād anabhyastayācñākārpaṇyamārgō* etc. Jātakamālā, 12, 5/6. The compound *pradānōcita* has taken root in Sanskrit literature. So it is met with in a stanza of Bhāravi's where it has been falsely interpreted by both Mallinātha and his successful rival Prof. Cappeller:

mahattvayōgāya mahāmahimnām
ārādhanīṁ tāṁ nṛpa dēvatānām |
dātuṁ pradānōcita bhūridhāmnīm
upāgataḥ siddhim ivāsmi vidyām ||
Kirātārjunīya III 23.

'*hē pradānōcita dānapātrabhūta*' (Mallinātha). 'um diese Wissenschaft... dir o König, der du der Gabe würdig bist, zu verleihen, bin ich gekommen' (Cappeller, HOS vol. XV, Cambridge Mass. 1912). Both interpretors have failed to see the effective antithesis

between *dātum upāgatō 'smi* and *pradānōcita*. 'I come to bestow this science on you who are wont yourself to bestow gifts on others'.

Canto IX.

3d. *chittvā kathām*

Prof. Leumann has the following remark: „*chittvā kathām* heisst nicht 'plunging at once into the subject', sondern 'die (bisher von Bhārgava mit seinen schülern geführte) unterhaltung unterbrechend'; vgl. im PW *kathām āchidya* (Kathās. LXI, 94) und ferner Jāt. 4 Ed. p. 119_{27} *kathaṁ pacchinditvā* 'die unterhaltung unterbrechend', wogegen ibid.$_{82}$ *kathaṁ samuṭṭhāpetvā* 'die unterhaltung beginnend'". Nevertheless Cowell was perfectly right in taking *kathā* to mean 'the usual compliments at meeting a person'. Of course *kathā* can mean 'unterhaltung' just as it can mean 'tale, story, romance' or 'sermon, lecture' etc. according to the context. Here it corresponds to the *saṁmodānīyā kathā sārāṇīyā* of the Pāli texts. The ceremonious compliments delivered at greeting a person were obligatory on every well-bred Hindu. *āgamanaprayōjanam avaśyaṁ praṣṭavyam* says Mallinātha ad Raghuvaṁśa V 3. Only plain rudeness or great urgency can account for *kathāchēda* i. e. cutting short of such compliments. Thus, king Purūravas is addressing a female cuckoo in a polite manner. But she will not heed him. Whereupon he asks rather astonished: *kathaṁ kathāvicchēdakāriṇī svakāryē vyāsaktā?* (Vikramōrvaśī ed. Bollensen 60, 6). Similarly it is said in one of Bhāsa's dramas:

> *Rāvaṇaḥ*: — *Vibhīṣaṇa | ēhy ēhi | upaviśa |*
> *Vibhīṣaṇaḥ*: — *ēṣa ēṣa upaviśāmi | (upaviśati)*
> *Rāvaṇaḥ*: — *Vibhīṣaṇa | nirviṇṇam iva tvāṁ lakṣayē |*
> *Vibhīṣaṇaḥ*: — *nirvēda ēva khalv anuraktagrāhiṇaṁ svāminam upāśritasya bhṛtyajanasya? |*
> *Rāvaṇaḥ*: — *chidyatām ēṣā kathā | tvam api tāvad vānaram ānaya |*
>
> Abhiṣēkanāṭaka p. 32/33.

Here, too, Rāvaṇa 'plunges into the subject' cutting short the complimentary kathā. *chidyatām ēṣā kathā* corresponds to *tiṣṭhatu praṇayaḥ* of other texts. Of course, it can have any other meaning; cp. e. g. Bhāsa's Dūtavākya v. 30.

35c. *prājñō janaḥ kō nu bhajēta śōkaṁ*

bhajēta is a conjecture of Cowell's. The MSS have *bhajētsa* CD and *bhajēcca* P. I think we must read *bhavēt saśōkō*. With respect to *v* for *j* see supra ad IV 102a.

41cd.—52.

These eleven and a half stanzas are wanting in Cowell's edition as his MSS have a long lacuna in their stead. They were, however, published by Mr. Nandargikar as an appendix to his edition of Cantos I—V of the Buddhacarita. Unfortunately, the MS the Indian scholar had at his disposal is not distinguished for particular accuracy. So I have thought it worth while to re-write the whole passage in a more correct shape. The task did not prove too difficult, as I could avail myself of a literal rendering from the Tibetan translation made by Wenzel and published by Prof. Leumann in the Communications of the Königliche Gelehrte Gesellschaft of Göttingen (1896. pp. 83—90). It will be seen that only one or two lines still remain questionable. The whole runs as follows:

jāmbūnadaṁ harmyam iva pradīptaṁ
viṣēṇa saṁyuktam ivōttamānnam |
grāhākulaṁ cāsthiram āravindaṁ
rājyaṁ ca ramyaṁ vyasanāśrayaṁ ca || 41 ||
itthaṁ ca rājyaṁ na sukhaṁ na dharmyaṁ
pūrvē tathā jātaghṛṇā narēndrāḥ |
vayaḥprakarṣē 'parihāryaduḥkhē
rājyāni muktvā vanam ēva jagmuḥ || 42 ||
varaṁ hi bhuktāni tṛṇāny araṇyē
tṛptiṁ paraṁ ratnam ivōpaguhya |
sahōṣitaṁ śrīsulabhāir na cāiva
dōṣāir adṛśyāir iva kṛṣṇasarpāiḥ || 43 ||
ślāghyaṁ hi rājyāni vihāya rājñāṁ
dharmābhilāṣēṇa vanaṁ pravēṣṭum |
bhagnapratijñasya na tūpapannaṁ
vanaṁ parityajya gṛhaṁ pravēṣṭum || 44 ||
jātaḥ kulē kō hi naraḥ sasattvō
dharmābhilāṣēṇa vanaṁ praviṣṭaḥ |
kāṣāyam utsṛjya vimuktalajjaḥ

puraṁdarasyāpi puraṁ śrayēta || 45 ||
lōbhād dhi mōhād atha vā bhayēna
yō vāntam annaṁ punar ādadīta |
lōbhāt sa mōhād atha vā bhayēna
saṁtyajya kāmān punar ādadīta || 46 ||
yaś ca pradīptāc charaṇāt kathaṁcin
niṣkramya bhūyaḥ praviśēt tad ēva |
gārhasthyam utsṛjya sa dṛṣṭadōṣō
mōhēna bhūyō 'bhilaṣēd grahītum || 47 ||
yā ca śrutir mōkṣam avāptavantō
nṛpā gṛhasthā iti nāitad asti |
śāmapradhānaḥ kva ca mōkṣadharmō
daṇḍapradhānā kva ca rājanītiḥ || 48 ||
śamē ratiś cēc chithilaṁ ca rājyaṁ
rājyē matiś cēc chamaviplavaś ca |
śamaṁ ca tāikṣṇyaṁ ca hi nōpapannaṁ
śītōṣṇayōr āikyam ivōdakāgnyōḥ || 49 ||
vahnēś ca tōyasya ca nāsti saṁdhiḥ
śaṭhasya satyasya ca nāsti mēlaḥ |
āryasya pāpasya ca nāsti prītiḥ
śamasya daṇḍasya ca nāsti yōgaḥ || 50 ||
tan niścayād vā vasudhādhipās tē
rājyāni muktvā śamam āptavantaḥ |
rājyārditā vā nibhṛtēndriyatvād
anāiṣṭhikaṁ mōkṣakṛtābhimānāḥ || 51 ||
tēṣāṁ ca rājyē 'stu śamō yathāvat
prāptō vanaṁ cāham u niścayēna |
chittvā hi pāśaṁ gṛhabandhusaṁjñaṁ
muktaḥ punar na pravivikṣur asmi || 52 ||

Notes.

41c. — *ca sthi[taṁ]* Cowell, *sti* for *sthi* P; the Tibetan translation seems to have been made from a different text as it reads: 'durch planet verwirrt Padma-habend wasser wie'.
42b. — Tib. favours *yathā* 'wie unrein geworden mann-herr(n) frühere'. In fact, *yathā* appears somewhat better as it can answer to *ittham*; it cannot, however, mean 'wie' but 'that; (so) — as'

— c. Tib. favours *parihārya°* 'leider gänzlich aufgeb alter vorzüglich Zeit'. But the negative compound ought to be preferred. Cp. III 33 ab and the preceding lines.

—d. *rājyāni muktvā* as 51 b, 44 a; Tib. favours *rājyaṁ vimuktvā* 'königreich gänzlich wegwerfend'.

43a. *varaṁ* ex conj. from Tib. 'besser', Bt *ciraṁ*.

—b. ex conj; Tib. 'kleinod wie (= *ratnam iva*) befriedigt best (= *tṛptiṁ paraṁ*?) nahe-umarmend (= *upaguhya*)'; Bt has *triṣaṅkavō ratnam ivōpaguptaḥ* which is pure nonsense.

44c. *na tūpa°* ex conj., Bt *nanūpa°*; Tib. not clear.

45a. *hi* ex conj., Bt *'pi*. Tib. is silent about either *hi* or *'pi* and gives the fourth pada as 'Stadt bewältig auch besuch nicht ist'. So I have thought awhile of *kō 'pi... pūuraṁdaraṁ nāpi puraṁ śrayēta*. But this would be false. There is no room for *na* in d. The whole stanza is an interrogative sentence. 'Is there any one... who... would abide even in...?' With respect to *śrayēta* cp. *śrayēya* 79d (Cowell) in an asseveration hinting at the idea conveyed by our stanza. The anuprāsa *puraṁdarasya puram* is repeated XIII 37d *puraṁdarasyēva purā*.

46a. *hi mōhād* ex conj., Bt reads *vimōhād* which is favoured also by Tib. ('vollkommen thorheit').

46d. *ādadīta* ex conj., Bt *ādadhīta*; Tib supports my conjecture which is, moreover, borne out by the general parallelism obtaining in these stanzas, as well as by a similar phrase in XI 19 d viz. *kaḥ kāmasaṁjñaṁ viṣam ādadīta* (C). Besides, *ādadhīta* is rather bad Sanskrit.

47a. Cp. *śaraṇāj jvalanena dahyamānān na hi niścikramiṣuḥ kṣamaṁ grahītum*, V 37cd Cp. e. g. Saundarananda VIII 19.

48. 49. 50. are given in the order of Tib., Bt inserts 48 after our 50.

48d. *daṇḍapradhānaḥ* and *rājadharmaḥ* are noticed prima manu in margin of Bt. Tib., too, has 'königs-Dharma'.

49a. *°cchitilaṁ* Bt (printer's error).

50. „Corrected into *saṁdhiḥ* for *mēlaḥ*, *sandhiḥ* for *prītiḥ* and *sandhiḥ* for *yōgaḥ* on the top of the same words of the verse in Bt. in the same hand as that of the text; but the original readings, though blotted with yellow fluid, are yet clearly visible“. (Mr. Nandargikar's note). Tib., too, gives four times 'verbind' = *saṁdhi*. This

may or may not be the genuine reading. At any rate, the three synonyms viz. *mēla*, *prīti* and *yōga*, are very cleverly selected.

51. This stanza is somewhat obscure. There is something wrong in the second half of it. Should we read: *vānibhṛtēndriyatvād anāiṣṭhikē mōha°*? This would justify the use of the disjunctive *vā—vā—*. Tib. has only a hiatus here as well as in the first half of the following stanza.

52a. *tēṣāś ca* Bt (printer's error).

—b. *cāham u* ex conj., though I am not sure of it. Bt has *mōham a°* which is meaningless. *ca* is warranted by *ca* in the first pāda, while *aham u* seems to come pretty near *mōham a°*, more so, at any rate, than e g. *asmi tu* or whatever else I tried to put instead of it.

—c. *°saṁjñaṁ* ex conj. from Tib., Bt *°saṅgaṁ*.

75c. *buddhaḥ parapratyayatō hi kō vrajēj*
(*janō 'ndhakūrē 'ndha ivāndhadēśikaḥ* ||)

Read *budhaḥ* in agreement with the metre. To act *parapratyayataḥ* is said of stupid or silly persons. See f. i.: *yatnēna tu pratyayanēyabuddhir vimōkṣam āpnōti parāśrayēṇa*, Śāundarananda V 17cd; *mūḍhaḥ parapratyayanēyabuddhiḥ*, Mālavikāgnimitra (ed. Bollensen) v. 2d.; *paṇḍidaparidōsappaccaā ṇaṁ mūḍhajādī*?, ibid. 25, 19; *parapratyayatāryapēlavamatiḥ*, Jātakamālā 69, 5; *parapratyayanēyabuddhitvāt*, ibid. 147, 12 etc. No doubt, the phrase is a standing one, though of course it may be slightly modified. Nevertheless there is perhaps a conclusion to be drawn from the instances quoted above. To be sure, *parapratyaya* is a current compound giving no room for any further remarks. But the case of *parapratyayanēyabuddhi* is somewhat different. This compound is too long to be an independent production of two different authors. Besides it has a distinctly rhythmical turn and must have arisen in a metrical passage rather than in prose, filling as it does almost an entire pāda of an upajāti stanza. It bears a stamp of individuality. And so I think we shall not be wide from the mark if we admit that the second instance from the Jātakamālā, quoted above, presupposes the Sāundarananda's and perhaps even the Mālavikāgnimitra's priority to that work. Can its author have been acquainted with the poems of Kālidāsa? All that has been said thus far of

the age of Ārya-Śūra is quite uncertain. We can only assert that he is later than Aśvaghōṣa.

77ab. *imaṁ tu dṛṣṭvāgamam avyavasthitaṁ*
yad uktam āptāis tad avēhi sādhv iti |

The idea is very popular in Sanskrit literature. Cp. e. g.:

atha yadi tē karmavicikitsā vā vṛttavicikitsā vā syāt | *yē tatra brāhmaṇāḥ sammarśinaḥ* | *yuktā ayuktāḥ* | *alūkṣā dharmakāmāḥ syuḥ* | *yathā tē tatra vartēran* | *tathā tatra vartēthāḥ* | and so on.

Taittirīya Upaniṣad 11, 3—4[1]).

or:

tarkō 'praviṣṭaḥ śrutayō vibhinnā
nāikō munir yasya vacaḥ pramāṇam |
dharmasya tattvaṁ nihitaṁ guhāyāṁ
mahājanō yēna gataḥ sa panthāḥ ||
Mahābhārata III 313, 17 (Southern recension).

or again:

matibhēdatamastirōhitē
gahanē kṛtyavidhāu vivēkinām |
sukṛtaḥ pariśuddha āgamaḥ
kurutē dīpa ivārthadarśanam ||
spṛhaṇīyaguṇāir mahātmabhiś
caritē vartmani yacchatāṁ manaḥ |
vidhihētur ahētur āgasāṁ
vinipātō 'pi samaḥ samunnatēḥ ||
Kirātārjunīya II, 33, 34.

---

[1]) Some passages of the Buddhacarita show that the Upaniṣads were not unknown to its author. One of them has been pointed out by Cowell viz. XII 64 (*muñjād iṣīkēva*) and Kaṭha-Up. II 6, 17. There is another line in our poem which reminds us of the same Upaniṣad viz.:

punarbhavō 'stīti ca kēcid āhur
nāstīti kēcin niyatapratijñāḥ |
BCar. IX 56 ab.

Cp. with this:

yēyaṁ prētē vicikitsā manuṣyē
astīty ēkē nāyam astīti cāikē |
Kaṭha-Up. I 1, 20.

Canto X.

4. *taṁ prēkṣya yō 'nyēna yayāu sa tasthāu*
yaś cātra tasthāu pathi sō 'nvagacchat |
drutaṁ yayāu yaḥ sadayaṁ sadhīraṁ
yaḥ kaścid āstē sma sa cōtpapāta ||

The entire stanza exhibits a marked parallelism in the construction of its four pādas. Thus we have: *yō yayāu — sa tasthāu*; *yas tasthāu — sō 'nvagacchat*; *yayāu yaḥ — sa-* (NB!); *ya āstē sma — sa utpapāta.* This parallelism alone would entitle us to look for a correlative pronoun as well as a second verbum finitum in c. Indeed, the conclusion thus arrived at is borne out by the fact that neither *sadayaṁ* nor *sadhīraṁ* can stand the test of a critical examination. The former, while grammatically correct, does not convey an idea opposed to *drutam*. The latter yields a good sense but is grammatically very hard and rather inadmissible in the work of a consummate stylist. All difficulties vanish if we read: *drutaṁ yayāu yaḥ sa jagāma dhīram.* This emendation will appear doubly sure if one considers that *jagā*]*ma* can be most easily misread as [*sa.*

26d. *sadbhiḥ sahīyā hi satāṁ samṛddhiḥ* ||

„Sic CP (i. e. CDP). Should we read *sahīyō* (neut.) for *sahīyasī?*" (Cowell, foot-note). There is a compound word met with in the Divyāvadāna which can perhaps throw some light on the enigmatic *sahīyā* or *sahīyas.* The whole passage runs: *kimarthaṁ dēvaḥ svayaṁ gacchati, ayaṁ Sudhanaḥ kumārō baladarpayuktaḥ, ēṣa daṇḍasahīyaḥ prēṣyatām iti* | ... *gaccha kumāra daṇḍasahīyaḥ kārvaṭikaṁ saṁnāmaya* | (Divyāv. 446, 2—5). Could we take *sadbhiḥ sahīyā* or °*yaḥ* to mean '(together) with good men?' I don't say yes! I merely ask. The late Prof. Speyer proposed to read *sadbhiḥ sahāyāir hi.*

27c. *vyūhāny anēkāni vigāhya bāṇāiḥ*

vigāh in connexion with *bāṇāiḥ* cannot but strike one as somewhat strange. Arrows are discharged from afar but not in immediate vicinity of the foe when one comes to close quarters with one's adversary. I should like to propose *vyūhān anēkān vinigṛhya bāṇāiḥ* though I am not sure to have restored the true wording of the

line. *vyūha* is of course masculine in classical Sanskrit. This cannot, however, be regarded as a decisive argument in favour of my conjecture as Aśvaghōṣa often uses such substantives in the neuter gender, both in this poem and in the Sāundarananda.

Canto XI.

39cd. *(duḥkhapratīkāranimittabhūtās*
tasmāt prajānāṁ viṣayā na bhōgyāḥ |)
aśnāmi bhōgam iti kō 'bhyupēyāt
prājñaḥ pratīkāravidhau pravṛttān ||

This stanza should be examined along with the next following one:

yaḥ pittadāhena vidahyamānaḥ
śītakriyāṁ bhōga iti vyavasyet
duḥkhapratīkāravidhau pravṛttaḥ
kāmeṣu kuryāt sa hi bhōgasaṁjñām ||

It is clear that there is something wrong in the latter half of 39; *pravṛttān* d must be corrected to *pravṛttaḥ* in agreement with 40 c. But then *aśnāmi* cannot be right. It has usurped the place of a substantive dependent on *abhyupēyāt* (just as *śītakriyām* is dependent on *vyavasyet*) and ought to be thrust out of it. As is often the case, here too the reading of P viz. *aśnāti* comes pretty near the truth. It stands for *annāni* and the whole ought to be read:

annāni bhōgā iti kō 'bhyupēyāt
prājñaḥ pratīkāravidhau pravṛttaḥ ||

Canto XII

30. *namaskāravaṣaṭkārau prōkṣaṇābhyukṣaṇādayaḥ |*
anupāya iti prājñāir upāyajña pravēditaḥ ||

I read *pravēditāḥ* as the predicate refers to what is enumerated in ab but not to *anupāya* c.

33. *ity avidyā hi vidvan sā pañcaparvā samīhatē |*
tamō mōhaṁ mahāmōhaṁ tāmisradvayam ēva vā ||

The correction adopted by me in the first half of this stanza is due to Speyer. In the second half *mōhaṁ mahāmōhaṁ* ought to be changed to *mōhō mahāmōhas*. The next half-stanza is given by Cowell as follows:

tatrālasyaṁ tamō viddhi mōhaṁ mṛtyuṁ ca janma ca |

The MSS read *mōha* CD and *mōhō* P. It it clear that an inversion has taken place. Two forms, viz. the nominative *mōhō* (*mahāmōhō*) 33c and the accusative *mōham* 34b have changed their respective places just as *punar* and *puram* in V 84, supra.

113c. *(tatas tadānīṁ gajarājavikramaḥ*
padasvanēnānupamēna bōdhitaḥ |)
mahāmunēr āgatabōdhiniścayō
(jagāda Kālō bhujagōttamaḥ stutim ||)

Read: *āgatabōdhiniścayāj*. 'After — or: as — the great muni has bent his mind upon the attainment of bōdhi, Kāla, the best of serpents, broke out into praises of him'.

Canto XIII.

21c. *(tāmrāruṇā lōhitabinducitrāḥ*
khaṭvāṅgahastā haridhūmrakēśāḥ |)
lambasrajō vāraṇalambakarṇāś
(carmāmbarāś cāiva nirambarāś ca ||)

Read: *lambatvacō*, in agreement with the tenor of the whole stanza.

60. *kāṣṭhaṁ hi mathnan labhatē hutāśaṁ*
bhūmiṁ khanan vindati cāpi tōyam |
nirbandhinaḥ kiṁcana nāsty asādhyaṁ [1])
nyāyēna yuktaṁ ca kṛtaṁ ca sarvam ||

Cp. the following stanza:

kāṣṭhād agnir jāyatē mathyamānād
bhūmis tōyaṁ khanyamānā dadāti |

---

[1]) Speyer's emendation of *nāsya sādhyam*.

sōtsāhānāṁ nāsty asādhyaṁ narāṇāṁ
mārgārabdhāḥ sarvayatnāḥ phalanti ||
Bhāsa, Pratijñāyāugandharāyaṇa, I v. 18.

There is no room for assuming chance coincidence. Bhāsa must have known the Buddhacarita. Cp. also Sāundarananda XVI 97; XVII 22.

Canto XIV.

20a. *yady ēva pāpakarmāṇah paśyēyuḥ karmaṇāṁ phalam* |

I should like to read *yady ēvaṁ*, the immediately preceding stanzas being devoted to a description of the results of evil actions.

---

2. Buddhacarita and Rāmāyaṇa II.

Already the first editor of the Buddhacarita, Prof. Cowell, has shown that the myth of Rāma is several times referred to in that poem. Yet, after having pointed out some two or three stanzas in which the legend of Rāma is alluded to, he concluded that „these references are vague, and do not necessarily imply the previous existence of our present Rāmāyaṇa". (Preface, p. XII). To be sure, this observation is pretty correct, but it does not settle the question. In fact, the references to the story of Rāma's exile, occurring in the Buddhacarita, are not limited to those few quoted by Cowell. They can be multiplied and some of them, on closer examination, do indeed prove interesting enough. To say it at once, we are able, with the help of them, to prove past all doubt that the author of the Buddhacarita was intimately acquainted not only „with the myth of Rāma" as Cowell says, but with the Rāmāyaṇa such as we know it to-day. This I intend to show by means of a certain number of stanzas taken from the both works and arranged on parallel columns. I shall, however, limit my quotations from the Rāmāyaṇa to those parallels that are met with in Book II of that poem. And that for two reasons. First, as it is only natural that Book II of Rāmāyaṇa, speaking as it does of Rāma's exile and of Daśaratha's despair and lament for his departed son, should exhibit

a greater parallelism with the preserved portion of the Buddhacarita, chiefly concerned with the Great Renunciation, than the remaining six which dwell at length upon subjects not treated in that poem. And secondly, because the great bulk of the Rāmāyaṇa does not favour detailed investigation of such kind extending over the whole of it.

The story of Rāma is alluded to in the following eight stanzas of the Buddhacarita, four of them referring to Book II of the great epos:

(1) VI, 36[1]. *nāsmi yātuṁ puraṁ śaktō*
dahyamānēna cētasā |
tvām araṇyē parityajya
Sumitra iva Rāghavam ||

Sumantra (d) is probably the correct reading. The above stanza is spoken by Chandaka, on the occasion of his parting with Siddhārtha, and refers to Sumantra's dismissal by Rāma as described in sarga 52 of Book II of the Rāmāyaṇa. The following three ślōkas are specially concerned:

sarāmam api tāvan mē rathaṁ dṛṣṭvā tadā janaḥ |
vinā Rāmaṁ rathaṁ dṛṣṭvā vidīryētāpi sā purī || 40 ||
dāinyaṁ hi nagarī gacchēd dṛṣṭvā śūnyam imaṁ ratham |
sūtāvaśēṣaṁ svaṁ sāinyaṁ hatavīram ivāhavē || 41 ||
ārtanādō hi yaḥ pāurāir unmuktas tvatpravāsanē |
sarathaṁ māṁ niśamyēva kuryuḥ śataguṇaṁ tataḥ || 44 ||

Cp. also the quotations given under (4), infra.

(2) VIII, 8. *niśamya ca srastaśarīragāminău*
vināgatău Śākyakularṣabhēṇa tău |
mumōca bāṣpaṁ pathi nāgarō janaḥ
purā rathē Dāśarathēr ivāgatē ||

This reference is probably the most important of all. It is alluding to the following ślōkas of the Rāmāyaṇa (Book II):

Sumantram abhidhāvantaḥ śataśō 'tha sahasraśaḥ |
kva Rāma iti pṛcchantaḥ sūtam abhyadravan narāḥ || 57, 9 ||

---

[1]) The Buddhacarita is quoted from my revised edition of the text, ready in MS.

dēva rājaratham dṛṣṭvā vinā Rāmam ihāgatam |
dūrād aśrumukhaḥ sarvō rājamārge gatō janaḥ || 59, 11 ||
harmyair vimānaiḥ prāsādair avekṣya ratham āgatam |
hāhākārakṛtā nāryō Rāmadarśanakarṣitāḥ || 59, 12 ||
āyatāir vimalair netrair aśruvēgapariplutāiḥ |
anyōnyam abhivīkṣante 'vyaktam ārtatarāḥ striyaḥ || 59, 13 ||

Cp. also 52. 40. 41. 44. quoted above.

(3) VIII, 79. *Ajasya rājñas tanayasya dhīmate*
narādhipasyendrasakhasya me spṛhā |
gate vanaṁ yas tanaye divaṁ gatō
na moghabāṣpaḥ kṛpaṇaṁ jijīva ha ||

These are words of king Śuddhōdana referring to the death of Daśaratha, Rāmāyaṇa II 64 (and especially ślōka 77 of that sarga).

(4) VIII, 81cd. *Daśaratha iva Rāmaśōkavaśyō*
bahu vilalāpa nṛpo visaṁjñakalpaḥ ||

This half stanza refers to several passages in sargas 58—64 of Book II of the Rāmāyaṇa.

The other four references are rather vague. They may however be quoted for completeness' sake. All of them occur in Canto IX.

(5) *yaṁ vaṁ vilayōpayayau tatas taṁ*
purōhitō mantradhareṇa sārdham |
yathā vanasthaṁ sahavāmadēvō
Rāmaṁ didṛkṣur munir Āurvaśeyaḥ || 9 ||

(6) *Bhīṣmeṇa Gaṅgōdarasaṁbhavēna*
Rāmeṇa Rāmeṇa ca Bhārgavena |
śrutvā kṛtaṁ karma pituḥ priyārthaṁ
pitus tvam apy arhasi kartum iṣṭam || 25 ||

(7) *tathā mahīṁ viprakṛtām anāryāis*
tapōvanād etya rarakṣa Rāmaḥ || 60 ||

(8) *gṛhapravēśaṁ prati yac ca mē bhavān*
uvāca Rāmaprabhṛtīn nidarśanam |
na te pramāṇam (78)

To these may be added a half stanza alluding to the legend of Sagara related in Book I of the Rāmāyaṇa, but known from other sources also.

vēlāṁ samudrē Sagaraś ca dadhē
nēkṣvākavō yāṁ prathamaṁ babandhuḥ || I, 49 ||

The Ikṣvākus are named in two or three stanzas more, viz. VII, 6; IX, 4 and XII, 1. Other stray allusions to legends or personages occurring among others in the Rāmāyaṇa will teach us nothing. — So much may suffice with respect to references to the Rāmāyaṇa. It is not unimportant that four of them out of eight are concerned with Book II of the Rāmāyaṇa as well as that almost all of them are limited to two consecutive Cantos of the Buddhacarita. It should be also noticed that with the exception of the vaguer ones all references quoted above are met with in connexion with Chanda's dismissal and his return to Kapilavāstu. It is clear that the corresponding scenes of the Rāmāyaṇa must have impressed themselves very strongly upon the poet's mind. This inference is borne out by a comparison of the parallel stanzas occuring in the both poems. The most interesting ones will of course be found in Canto VIII of the Buddhacarita.

Before turning to them, however, I have thought it worth while to quote the first fourteen stanzas of it in full, in order to make the general parallelism appear more evident. They run as follows:

tatas turaṅgāvacaraḥ sa durmanās
tathā vanaṁ bhartari nirmamē gatē |
cakāra yatnaṁ pathi śōkanigrahē
tathāpi cāivāśru na tasya cikṣiyē || 1 ||
yam ēkarātrēṇa tu bhartur ājñayā
jagāma mārgaṁ saha tēna vājinā |
iyāya bhartur virahaṁ vicintayaṁs
tam ēva panthānam ahōbhir aṣṭabhiḥ || 2 ||
hayaś ca sāujā vicacāla Kanthakas
tatāma bhāvēna babhūva nirmadaḥ |
alaṁkṛtaś cāpi tathāiva bhūṣaṇāir
abhūd gataśrīr iva tēna varjitaḥ || 3 ||
nivṛtya cāivābhimukhas tapōvanaṁ
bhṛśaṁ jihēṣē karuṇaṁ muhur muhuḥ |
kṣudhānvitō 'py adhvani śaṣpam ambu vā
yathā purā nābhinananda nādadē || 4 ||

tatō vihīnaṁ Kapilāhvayaṁ puraṁ
mahātmanā tena jagaddhitātmanā |
kramēṇa tāu śūnyam ivōpajagmatur
divākarēṇēva vinākṛtaṁ nabhaḥ || 5 ||
sapuṇḍarīkāir api śōbhitaṁ jalāir
alaṁkṛtaṁ puṣpadharāir nagāir api |
tad eva tasyōpavanaṁ vanōpamaṁ
gataprahar̥ṣāir na rarāja nāgarāiḥ || 6 ||
tatō bhramadbhir diśi dīnamānasāir
anujjvalāir bāṣpahatēkṣaṇāir narāiḥ |
nivāryamāṇāv api tāv ubhāu puraṁ
śanāi rajaḥsnātam ivābhijagmatuḥ || 7 ||
niśamya ca srastaśarīragāmināu
vināgatāu Śākyakularṣabhēṇa tāu |
mumōca bāṣpaṁ pathi nāgarō janaḥ
purā rathe Dāśarather ivāgate || 8 ||
atha bruvantaḥ samupētamanyavō
janāḥ pathi cChandakam āgatāśravaḥ |
kva rājaputraḥ kularāṣṭravardhanō
hṛtas tvayāsāv iti pṛṣṭhatō 'nvayuḥ || 9 ||
tataḥ sa tan bhaktimatō 'bravīj janān
narendraputraṁ na parityajāmy aham |
rudann ahaṁ tena tu nirjanē vane
gṛhasthavesaś ca visarjitāv iti || 10 ||
idaṁ vacas tasya niśamya te janāḥ
suduṣkaraṁ khalv iti niścayaṁ yayuḥ |
patad vijahruḥ salilaṁ na nētrajaṁ
manō nininduḥ saphalāgham ātmanaḥ || 11 ||
athōcur adyāiva viśāma tad vanaṁ
gataḥ sa yatra dviparājavikramaḥ |
jijīviṣā nāsti hi tena nō vinā
yathēndriyāṇāṁ vigame śarīriṇām || 12 ||
idaṁ puraṁ tena vivarjitaṁ vanaṁ
vanaṁ ca tat tena samanvitaṁ puram |
na śōbhate tena vinādya naḥ puraṁ
Marutvatā Vṛtravadhe yathā divam || 13 ||
punaḥ kumārō vinivṛtta ity athō
gavākṣamālāḥ pratipēdire 'ṅganāḥ |

viviktapṛṣṭhaṁ ca niśamya vājinaṁ
punar gavākṣāṇi pidhāya cukruśuḥ || 14 ||
praviṣṭadīkṣas tu sutōpalabdhayē
vratēna śōkēna ca khinnamānasaḥ |
jajāpa dēvāyatanē narādhipaś
cakāra tās tāś ca yathāśrayāḥ kriyāḥ || 15 ||
tataḥ sa bāṣpapratipūrṇalōcanas
turaṅgam ādāya turaṅgapālakaḥ |
vivēśa śōkābhihatō nṛpālayaṁ
kṣayaṁ vinītē ripuṇēva bhartari || 16 ||

With the above have to be compared the following ślokas of the Rāmāyaṇa (sarga 57, 3 sqq.):

anujñātaḥ Sumantrō 'tha yōjayitvā hayōttamān |
Ayōdhyām ēva nagarīṁ prayayāu gāḍhadurmanāḥ || 3 ||
sa vanāni sugandhīni saritaś ca sarāṁsi ca |
paśyan yattō yayāu śīghraṁ grāmāṇi nagarāṇi ca || 4 ||
tataḥ sāyāhnasamayē dvitīyē 'hani sārathiḥ |
Ayōdhyāṁ samanuprāpya nirānandāṁ dadarśa ha || 5 ||
sa śūnyām iva niḥśabdāṁ dṛṣṭvā paramadurmanāḥ |
Sumantraś cintayāmāsa śōkavēgasamāhataḥ || 6 ||
kaccin na sagajā sāśvā sajanā sajanādhipā |
Rāmasaṁtāpaduḥkhēna dagdhā śōkāgninā purī || 7 ||
iti cintāparaḥ sūtō vājibhiḥ śīghrayāyibhiḥ |
nagaradvāram āsādya tvaritaḥ pravivēśa ha || 8 ||
Sumantram abhidhāvantaḥ śataśō 'tha sahasraśaḥ |
kva Rāma iti pṛcchantaḥ sūtam abhyadravan narāḥ || 9 ||
tēṣāṁ śaśaṁsa Gaṅgāyām aham āpṛcchya Rāghavam |
anujñātō nivṛttō 'smi dhārmikēṇa mahātmanā || 10 ||
tē tīrṇā iti vijñāya bāṣpapūrṇamukhā narāḥ |
ahō dhig iti niḥśvasya hā Rāmēti vicukruśuḥ || 11 ||
śuśrāva ca vacas tēṣāṁ vṛndaṁ vṛndaṁ ca tiṣṭhatām |
hatāḥ smaḥ khalu yē nēha paśyāma iti Rāghavam || 12 ||
dānayajñavivāhēṣu samājēṣu mahatsu ca |
na drakṣyāmaḥ punar jātu dhārmikaṁ Rāmam antarā || 13 ||
kiṁ samarthaṁ janasyāsya kiṁ priyaṁ kiṁ sukhāvaham |
iti Rāmēṇa nagaraṁ pitrēva paripālitam || 14 ||

vātāyanagatānāṁ ca strīṇām anvantarāpaṇam |
Rāmam ēvābhitaptānāṁ śuśrāva paridēvanām || 15 ||
sa rājamārgamadhyēna Sumantraḥ pihitānanaḥ |
yatra rājā Daśarathas tad ēvōpayayāu gṛham || 16 ||
yō 'vatīrya rathāc chīghraṁ rājavēśma praviśya ca |
kakṣyāḥ saptābhicakrāma mahājanasamākulāḥ || 17 ||

The order in which the events follow each other in both poems is much the same. First, the charioteer's return-journey and his entrance into the capital, sadly changed through the absence of the young prince. Then a vivid scene showing the charioteer assailed by citizens, greedy of news. Their lament and dejectedness. The women's precipitate running at the windows and their withdrawing, in deep depression, to the inner apartments. Finally, the charioteer's entrance into the king's presence. The parallelism is undeniable. It will appear still more striking if a number of stanzas of the Buddhacarita be singled out and examined one by one. Thus we have:

hayaś ca sāujā vicacāla Kanthakas
tatāma bhāvēna babhūva nirmadaḥ |
BC. VIII 3 ab.

mama tv aśvā nivṛttasya
na prāvartanta vartmani |
uṣṇam aśru vimuñcanti
Rāmē saṁprasthitē vanam ||
R. II 59, 1.

athōcur adyāiva viśāma tad vanaṁ
gataḥ sa yatra dvijarājavikramaḥ |
BC. VIII 12 ab.

tē Lakṣmaṇa iva kṣipraṁ
sapatnyaḥ sahabāndhavāḥ |
gacchantam anugacchāmō
yēna gacchati Rāghavaḥ ||
udyānāni parityajya
kṣētrāṇi ca gṛhāṇi ca |
ēkaduḥkasukhā Rāmam
anugacchāma dhārmikam ||
R. II 33, 16. 17.
Cp. also II 36, 33; II 37. 25—27.

idaṁ puraṁ tēna vivarjitaṁ vanaṁ
vanaṁ ca tat tēna samanvitaṁ puraṁ |

vanaṁ nagaram ēvāstu
yēna gacchati Rāghavaḥ |

asmābhiś ca parityaktaṁ
puraṁ saṁpadyatāṁ vanam ||
R. II 33, 22.

nahi tad bhavitā rāṣṭraṁ
yatra Rāmō na bhūpatiḥ |
tad vanaṁ bhavitā rāṣṭraṁ
yatra Rāmō nivatsyati ||
R. II 37, 29.
Cp. also 71, 24 ab.

na śōbhate tēna vinādya naḥ puraṁ
Marutvatā Vṛtravadhē yathā divam ||
BC. VIII 13.

tatas tv Ayōdhyā rahitā ma-
[*hātmanā*
Puraṁdarēṇēva mahī saparvatā |
cacāla
R. II 41, 20 ab.

vivēśa śōkābhihatō nṛpālayaṁ
kṣayaṁ vinītē ripuṇēva bhartari ||
BC. VIII 16 cd.

vinītavīrapuruṣaṁ
praviśya tu nṛpālayam |
R. II 33, 28 ab.
Cp. also 52, 41 quoted above p. 28.

The evident parallelism of such passages as f. i. the last two quoted above is no doubt very significant. In my opinion it proves that Book II of the Rāmāyaṇa as known to Aśvaghōṣa must have resembled our present text in such a degree that there is no reason to believe it was different from it. But if this inference is correct, as indeed I am sure it is, then we are able to assure the sense of *suduṣkaram,* BC VIII 11 and 77 which has been differently explained by recent interpretors. Here too, we can avail ourselves of some parallel ślōkas:

idaṁ vacas tasya niśamya tu janāḥ
suduṣkaraṁ khalv iti niścayaṁ yayuḥ |
BC. VIII 11 ab.

taṁ vipram agnyagārasthaṁ
vanditvā Lakṣmaṇō 'bravīt |
sakhē 'bhyāgaccha paśya tvaṁ
vēśma duṣkarakāriṇaḥ ||
R. II 32, 2.
duṣkaraṁ kriyatē putra
sarvathā Rāghava priya |

tvayā hi matpriyārthaṁ tu
vanam ēvam upāśritam ||
R. II 34, 35.

Prof. Lüders has taken *suduṣkara* in the above stanza of the Buddhacarita to mean 'höchst wunderbar'. But it is clear that it is used in our poem in the same sense as *duṣkara* in the parallel ślōkas of the Rāmāyaṇa. Now the sense of *duṣkara* as quoted above is assured by that of its opposite *sukara* occurring in the same portion of the Rāmāyaṇa, viz.:

yathā ca manyē durjīvam ēvaṁ na sukaraṁ dhruvam |
ācchidya putrē niryātē Kāusalyā yatra jīvati ||
II 57, 22.

Thus it seems pretty sure that we must assign to *su]duṣkara* its proper meaning viz. '(very) difficult'. The same meaning must be attributed to that adjective in the following two stanzas which are, moreover, pretty parallel:

Suvarṇaniṣṭhīvini mṛtyunā hṛtē
suduṣkaraṁ yan na mamāra
[*Sṛñjayaḥ* |
ahaṁ tu
BC. VIII 77.

Kāusalyā ca Sumitrā ca
putraśōkābhipīḍitē |
duṣkaraṁ yadi jīvētām
R. II 73, 8.

There is another set of stanzas in Canto VIII of the Buddhacarita containing reminiscences from a parallel passage of the Rāmāyana. It occurs in Yaśōdharā's lament over her husband's departure for the forest and insists on the incongruity between the easy life he has enjoyed thus far and the drawbacks of dwelling in a hermitage.

sujātajālāvatatāṅgulī mṛdū
nigūḍhagulphāu viṣapuṣpakōmalāu |
vanāntabhūmiṁ kaṭhināṁ kathaṁ
[*nu tāu*
sacakramadhyāu caraṇāu gamiṣ-
[*yataḥ* ||

kathaṁ rathāir vibhur yātvā
gajāśvāiś ca muhur muhuḥ |
padbhyāṁ Rāmō mahāraṇyē
vatsō mē vicariṣyati ||

vimānapṛṣṭhē śayanāsanōcitaṁ
mahārhavastrāgurucandanārcitam |
kathaṁ nu śītōṣṇajalagamēṣu tac

yasya cāhārasamayē
sūdāḥ kuṇḍaladhāriṇaḥ |
ahaṁpūrvāḥ pacanti sma

charīram ōjasvi vanē bhaviṣyati ||
kulēna sattvēna balēna varcasā
śrutēna lakṣmyā vayasā ca garvitaḥ |
pradātum ēvābhyucitō na yācituṁ
kathaṁ sa bhikṣāṁ paratas cariṣyati ||
śucāu śayitvā śayanē hiraṇmayē
prabōdhyamānō niśi turyanisvanāiḥ |
kathaṁ bata svapsyati sō'dya mē vratī
paṭāikadēśāntaritē mahītalē ||
BC. VIII 55—58.

Cp. also:
vimānaśayanārhaṁ hi
sāukumāryam idaṁ kva ca |
kharadarbhāṅkuravatī
tapōvanamahī kva ca ||
BC. VI 28.

prasannāḥ pānabhōjanam ||
sa kathaṁ nu kaṣāyāṇi
tiktāni kaṭukāni ca |
bhakṣayan vanyam āhāraṁ
sutō mē vartayiṣyati ||
mahārhavastrasaṁbuddhō
bhūtvā cirasukhōcitaḥ |
kāṣāyaparidhānas tu
kathaṁ Rāmō bhaviṣyati ||
R. II 12, 95—98.

kva nu vatsyati dharmātmā
vṛkṣamūlam upāśritaḥ |
sō 'tyantasukhitaḥ sūta
kim aśiṣyati Rāghavaḥ ||
duḥkhasyānucitō duḥkhaṁ
Sumantra śayanōcitaḥ |
bhūmipālātmajō bhūmāu
śētē katham anāthavat ||
R. II 58, 5. 6.
Cp. also II, 24, 2. 3.

Such coincidences as f. i.

. . . . *ucitaṁ*
mahārhavastra . . . . . |
kathaṁ . . . .
. . . . *bhaviṣyati* ||

mahārhavastra . . . . . .
. . . . *ucitaḥ* |
. . . .
kathaṁ . . . *bhaviṣyati* ||

cannot be due to chance. Aśvaghōṣa was of course an independent poet (he needs no defence!) but he must have read the ślōkas quoted above.

Another stanza of Aśvaghōṣa's occurring in the same Canto and referring to king Śuddhōdana has got an exceptionally convincing parallel in a similar stanza of the Rāmāyaṇa. Compare:

niśāmya ca cChandakakanthakāv ubhāu
sutasya saṁśrutya ca niścayaṁ sthiram |
papāta śōkābhihatō mahīpatiḥ
Śacīpatēr vṛtta ivōtsavē dhvajaḥ ||
BC. VIII 73.

and

saṁraktanētraḥ śithilāmbaras tathā
vibhūtasarvābharaṇaḥ paraṁtapaḥ |
babhūva bhūmau patitō nṛpatmajaḥ
Śacīpatēḥ ketur ivōtsavakṣayē ||
R. II 74, 36, (Cp. 77, 9).

An instance of identical anuprasa is the following:

gatō nṛdēvaḥ sa hi dēvi dēvavat ||
BC. VIII 43.

dēvi devasya pādāu ca
devavat paripālaya ||
R. II 58, 18.

Cp.:
devi dēvaś ca dēvī ca
samāgamya madantarē |
mantrayēte
R. II 16, 15.

papāta sahasā devī
dēvatēva divaś cyutā ||
R. II 20, 32.

We will now turn to instances occurring in the remaining Cantos of the Buddhacarita. Some of them are no less convincing as can be seen from the quotations given below.

tasyātiśōbhāvisṛtātiśōbhā
raviprabhā vāstatamaḥprabhāvā |
BC. I 15.

vyarājayata Vāidēhī
vēśma tat suvibhūṣitā |
udyatō 'ṁśumataḥ kālē
khaṁ prabhēva vivasvataḥ ||
R. II 39, 18.

As an instance of the same simile repeated in a much later work the following half-stanza may be quoted:

jyōtsnēva candramasam acchavibhēva sūryaṁ
taṁ bhūmipālakam abhūṣayad āyatākṣī ||

Haricandra, Campūjīvandhara, ed. T. S. Kuppusvami Sastri, Tanjore 1905, I v. 17.

stēyādibhiś cāpy abhitaś ca naṣṭaṁ
svasthaṁ svacakraṁ paracakra-
[*muktam* |

nānāvṛṣṭir babhūvāsmin
na durbhikṣaḥ satāṁ varē |

kṣemaṁ subhikṣaṁ ca babhūva tasya
purānaranyasya yathāiva rāṣṭrē ||
BC. II 15.

Anaraṇyē mahārājē
taskarō vāpi kaścana ||
R. II 110, 10.

tataḥ kṛtē śrīmati rājamārgē
BC. III 6 a.

rājamārgaḥ kṛtaḥ śrīmān
pāurāi Rāmābhiṣēcanē ||
R. II 6, 17.

kōkilō yatra kūjati ||
BC. IV 44 d.

kōkilas tāta kūjati ||
R. II 52, 2 d.

What deserves attention in the above instance is the identical position occupied by the same words in the pāda.

viyujyamānē hi tarāu
puṣpāir api phalair api |
patati cchidyamānē vā
tarur anyō na śōcati ||
BC. IV 61.

bhidyamānam ivāśaktas
trātum anyō nagō nagam |
R. II 63, 43.

kutō ratim
BC. IV 98 c.

kutō ratiḥ |
R. II 12, 11 b.

Same remark as regarding the last but one quotation. The position is at the end of a pāda of a vaṁśastha stanza.

tyaja buddhim imām atipravṛttām
avahāsyō 'timanōrathō 'kramaś ca ||
BC. V 36.

atikrāntam atikrāntam
anavāpya manōratham |
R. II 87, 17 ab.

imaṁ Tārkṣyōpamajavaṁ
turaṅgam anugacchatā |
darśitā sāumya madbhaktir
vikramaś cāyam ātmanaḥ ||
BC. VI 5.

gatiṁ khara ivāśvasya
Tārkṣyasyēva patattriṇaḥ |
anugantuṁ na śaktir mē
gatiṁ tava mahīpatē ||
R. II 105, 6.

BC. VI 37 reminds us, in a certain way, of R. II 52, 45.

yō hi candramasas tāikṣṇyaṁ
kathayēc chraddadhīta vā |
sa dōṣāṁs tava dōṣajña
kathayēc chraddadhīta vā ||
BC. VI 40.

nahi kaṁcana paśyāmō
Rāghavasyāguṇaṁ vayam |
durlabhō hy asya nirayaḥ
śaśāṅkasyēva kalmaṣam ||
R. II 37, 27.

mahatyā tṛṣṇayā duḥkhāir
garbhēṇāsmi yayā dhṛtaḥ |
tasyā niṣphalayatnāyāḥ
kvāhaṁ mātuḥ kva sā mama ||
BC. VI 45.

mayā hi cirapuṣṭēna
duḥkhasaṁvardhitēna ca |
viprayujyata Kāusalyā
phalakālē dhig astu mām ||
R. II 53, 20.

The purport of the pathetical exclamation being much the same in both cases, Aśvaghōṣa has yet succeeded to give it a much deeper turn.

Sarvārthasiddhō vapuṣābhibhūya
tam āśramaṁ siddha iva prapēdē ||
BC. VII 1.

balēna guptō Bharatō mahātmā
. . . .
. . . .
gṛhād yayāu siddha ivēndra-
[lōkāt ||
R. II 70, 30.

...astaṁ ca yayāu vivasvān |
...tapaḥpraśāntaṁ sa vanaṁ vivēśa ||
BC. VII 32.

naṣṭajvalanasaṁtāpā
praśāntādhyāyasatkriyā |
timirēṇānuliptēva
tadā sā nagarī babhāu ||
R. II 48, 34.

So we see that Cowell was right, despite Böhtlingk's objection, when taking *tapaḥpraśānta* to mean 'where penances had now ceased'. BC. IX 24 reminds one of R. II 59, 28—31.

pranaṣṭavatsām iva vatsalāṁ gām
BC. IX, 26 c.

sāhaṁ gāur iva siṁhēna
vivatsā vatsalā kṛtā |
R. II 43, 18.

śōkāgninā tvadvirahēndhanēna
niḥśvāsadhūmēna tapaḥśikhēna |
tvaddarśanaṁ vāñchati dahyamānam
antaḥpuraṁ cāivapuraṁ ca kṛtsnam ||
BC. IX 29.

ayaṁ tu mām ātmabhavas
tavādarśanamārutaḥ |
vilāpaduḥkhasamidhō
ruditāśruhutāhutiḥ ||
cintābāṣpamahādhūmas
tavāgamanacintajaḥ |
karśayitvādhikaṁ putra
niḥśvāsāyāsasaṁbhavaḥ ||
tvayā vihīnām iha māṁ
śōkāgnir atulō mahān |

pradhakṣyati yathā kakṣyaṁ
citrabhānur himātyayē ||
R. II 24, 6. 7. 8.

BC. XIII 49 b *cittamōham* has been conjectured by Speyer for the meaningless *mōhacittam* of the MSS. (*mōhacitram*, Böhtlingk). The compound *cittamōha* occurs twice in Book II of the Rāmāyaṇa viz. 12, 2 b and 64, 72 c. Cp. also ***buddhimōha***, ib. 73, 24 c.

I have also noticed a rather considerable number of coincidences of minor importance. They reveal to us many an interesting particular concerning the technical side of Aśvaghōṣa's poetry. For this reason I have thought it better to relegate them into a full commentary on the Buddhacarita which I intend to publish along with a revised text of that poem.

What has been said and quoted thus far, enables us to conclude with a sufficient amount of certainty that at the time of Aśvaghōṣa there existed at least Book II of the Rāmāyaṇa (but most probably the remaining genuine books also) in much the same form as it is known to us to-day. It can be added that the great Buddhist poet was influenced by Vālmīki in no lesser degree than he has himself influenced the greatest classical poet of India, Kālidāsa. Both of them must have devoted a careful study to the works of their respective predecessors. A detailed comparison of the poems of the three great makers of Sanskrit — Vālmīki, Aśvaghōṣa, Kālidāsa — shows, how much patient labour and assiduous exertion, in the course of long centuries, was needed, before assuring to the Sanskrit language the renown of the most refined means of poetical expression the world has ever witnessed.

---

3. Critical notes on the printed text of the Jātakamālā.

The second issue of Prof. Kern's admirable edition of the Jātakamālā is a stereotyped impression. Accordingly, the editor was obliged to renounce the opportunity of improving the text by adopting the numerous corrections contained in a list of errata prefixed to it. Let us hope that this neglect — for such it is, after all — will be compensated in a third edition, no more a mere

reprint of the present one. This is all the more desirable as the list of corrigenda which is fronting page 1 of the printed text, can be increased by some twenty or twenty five errors which have escaped the revisor's attention. But there is another list of corrections which should be had in view before proceeding to the revision of our text for a future edition. As is well known, the late Prof. Speyer has published an English version of Ārya-Śūra's book, one of the very best translations of a Sanskrit text we can boast. In the course of his work the learned translator (who was more deeply familiar with the Genius of the Language than are most Sanskrit scholars outside India) has brought a rather large number of corrections and conjectural emendations of various passages of the original text. His remarks should not have passed unobserved. But of course neither the editor nor the translator were able to purge the text for good and all of all those minute and yet troublesome defects of reading and deficiencies of style for which the Nepalese MSS. are distinguished. So I have made up my mind to give here a selection from my notes on the Jātakamālā taken now and then on the occasion of repeated perusal of that work. In the first place I will point out half a dozen metrical blunders occurring in the printed text and not discovered by Speyer. They are:

II, 4d. *mahāhradaṁ vanagajā yathāiva.*
Read: *vanyagajā.*

IX, 20c. *dharmānurāgān nayanirapēkṣas*
Read: *nirvyapēkṣas.*

X, 35b. *syāc chīlē 'pi lōkapaktyabhimukhaḥ svargē ca jātaspṛhaḥ* |
A light syllable is wanting after *'pi. 'pi ca* is probably the true reading.

XIII, 23d. *alaṁ madutpīḍanāśaṅkayā tē* ||
Read: *madutpīḍanaśaṅkayā.*

XVII, 13a. *yat pītvā madadōṣavihvalatayāsvatantraś caran.*
Two heavy syllables are wanting after °*vihvalatayā*, but I am unable to restore the original reading.

XXXII, 33a. *vyāghrāḥ pibanti rudhirāṇi vanamṛgāṇāṁ.*
Read: *vanē mṛgāṇāṁ.* Speyer's translation 'the deer *of* the forest' should be slightly modified.

Of course I don't affirm to have discovered all passages which break the metre, but the examples quoted above in addition to nearly as many others corrected by Speyer prove beyond dispute that the printed text of the Jātakamālā is still open to criticism, despite the careful treatment it has received at the hands of Prof. Kern. This fact may serve as the *raison d'être* of the corrections I am going to propose. They should not be regarded as purely arbitrary suggestions. Some of them are sure emendations; some others deserve to be taken into consideration.

V, 25. *saṁpattir ēva vittānām adhruvā sthitir ātmanaḥ* |
iti yācanakaṁ labdhvā na samṛddhir avēkṣyatē ||

The latter half of this stanza has been rendered by Speyer as follows: 'we need not care for riches when getting a mendicant'. The translation is of course irreproachable, but it shows that there is something wrong in the original text. Śakra tries to avert Aviṣahya i. e. Bōdhisattva from giving to the poor his own necessaries of life. He says: Don't give away the few you can procure but wait till you have recovered your former wealth and can afford to gratify the mendicants. (Cp. for instance: *itthaṁgataḥ sann api cēn na dadyā yāyāḥ punaḥ pūrvasamṛddhiśōbhām* v. 9; or: *paryāptavibhavasya... ayaṁ kramō nēmāṁ daśām abhiprapannasya*, p. 25, ll. 5—7 etc.) Now the stanza quoted above contains a refutatory answer to Śakra's arguments. Accordingly, *apēkṣyate* should be read instead of *avēkṣyatē*. The meaning is: 'we must not wait for riches i. e. wait till we acquire some, when a mendicant is there and cries for instant help'.

VIII, 36 ab. *asaṁstutānām api na kṣamēya*
pīḍāṁ kathaṁ kāiva kathā bhavatsu.

kathaṁ is wholly superfluous and very hard to explain; moreover, inelegant. It is omitted in Speyer's translation which runs as follows: 'I am not capable of bearing the pain of strangers, how then can you suppose I should bear your suffering?' I think we have to read *pīḍām ahaṁ. kathaṁ* is probably due to the inadvertence of a copyist who anticipated two akṣaras of the following *kathā*.

VIII, 42d. *saṁcikṣipē na kṣatajaṁ kṣarad vā.*

'and the flowing blood did not lessen' (Speyer). *samcikṣiyē* is probably the correct reading. *p* for *y* (and inversely) is rather common in the MSS. The same blunder occurs in Buddhacarita VIII, 1d where *cikṣipē* has been corrected to *cikṣiyē* by Böhtlingk. He could have adduced in support of his emendation the various readings ad VII, 18c viz. *kṣipamti* P and *kṣapēti* C for *kṣiyanti* of the text.

IX, 23ab. *rēmē na vinayōnmārgē dvēṣmi cāhaṁ pramāditām* |

The first sing. perfect is against the rule of grammar. I read *ramē* which is also required by the parallel form *dvēṣmi*.

IX, 53. *ālōkō bhavati yataḥ samaś ca mārgō*
lōkō 'yaṁ vrajati tatō na durgamēṇa |
prāyō 'smiñ jagati tu matsarāndhakārē-
ṇānyē na praṇayapadāni mē vahanti ||

Speyer's translation of this somewhat intricate stanza runs as follows: 'Where a light is and an even road, there it is easy for men to go. But in this world the darkness of selfishness prevails to such a degree that no other men would support my words of request'. Now, *matsarāndhakārēṇānyē na*, is an emendation by Böhtlingk for °*kārē nānyē*. I think the reading of the MSS should be restored (*nānyē na* should be read together: *nānyēna*), first, because it yields a very good meaning, but then, because Ārya-Śūra is exceedingly particular about his caesuras and we have no right to disagree with him in this respect. The situation makes things clear. A brahmin who has abused the hospitality of Prince Viśvantara by requiring of him his two children, tries to account for his ingratitude and says: 'Men go their way where there is a light and an even road not (caring) the impracticable one. But as this world is steeped in the darkness of selfishness, my words of request have no other way to choose (save that of ingratitude to you; *nānyēna* = *durgamēṇa* scil. *mārgēṇa*)'. Speyer's translation is correct but cannot satisfy; a b as translated by him, has nothing to do with c d.

P. 64, l. 10 *ākrīḍāsthānē*
'in the play-ground' (Speyer). *ākrīḍasthānē* is certainly better. Cp. XIII, 23d, supra p. 41.

X, 27d. *vilayam īyur asaṅgam upadravāḥ* ||

I should propose *asaṅga* (Loc. absol.) Speyer has 'having lost their hold'.

XI, 6. *tataḥ pravṛttē tumulē sphūrjatpraharaṇē raṇē* |
paṭahadhvaninōtkruṣṭāiḥ sphuṭatīva nabhastalam ||

I read *nabhastalē* because *raṇē* b is the first of a long series of absolute locatives extending over vv. 6—9 and determining v. 10. Moreover, only past tenses are used throughout the description of that battle.

P. 98, l. 14. *praviruröhatuḥ*

Can this be the reading of the MSS?

P. 102, l. 1. *apūrvaḥ khalv ayam atrabhavataḥ paśya vikrayārambhaḥ* |

The position of *paśya* is decidedly suspected. Read: *paṇyavikrayā°* which is warranted by *paṇyānāṁ vikrayakramaḥ* (= *paṇyavikrayārambhaḥ*) in the stanza immediately following and completing the words just quoted (v. 9) as well as by the same blunder detected and corrected by Speyer in v. 15d, viz. *sā paṇyatām* (for *paśya tām* of the printed text) *upagatā nihitātra kumbhē.*

XVII, 28ab. *laghur api ca vipākō madyapānasya yaḥ syān manujagatigatānāṁ śīladṛṣṭīḥ sa hanti* |

The plural *śīladṛṣṭīḥ* can be defended (on account of the plurality of its complement) but nonetheless *śīladṛṣṭī* seems better. Speyer has: 'the good conduct and the good understanding'.

P. 111 l. 20 & p. 118, l. 3. *pratinivṛtya*

Somewhat unusual, if not a simple misreading. I should like to change it to *pratinivṛttya* ('went back' & 'turned back', Speyer).

P. 120, ll. 6—7. *kāryaśēṣaparisamāptyāyācñayā*

This has been changed by the learned editor himself to °*parisamāptiyācñayā*, a substantive *āyācñā* being unknown (Various Readings, ad locum). I think the true reading lies nearer at hand. Separate: °*parisamāptyā* (Gen.) *yācñayā.*

XX, 29. *nivāraṇārthāni sagadgadāni*
vākyāni sāśrūṇi ca lōcanāni |

praṇāmalōlāni śirāṁsi cāiṣāṁ
mānaṁ samānasya yathā karōti ||

mānaṁ cannot be possibly good. Since the Accusative is excluded by the general structure of the clause and the neuter gender by grammar, we must read *mānaḥ*. Speyer's translation is: 'As sure as it is great regard for their friend deserving regard, that makes their eyes full of tears etc.'

XXII, 33 a. *antaḥ sapatnaḥ kōpō 'yaṁ*

It seems better to take *antaḥsapatnaḥ* as a compound word.

P. 137, ll. 11—12. *tāu haṁsapradhānāu kāñcanapuñjāv iva śriyābhijvalanmanōhararūpāu.*

The last complex of akṣaras must be taken to represent *śriyā abhijvalanmanōhararūpāu* (for of course it cannot be divided into *śriyābhijvalan* (Nom.) referring to the king mentioned shortly before and *manōhararūpāu* qualifying the two swans). Now, such a construction might be defended in a less accomplished stylist but not in Ārya Śūra. So I think we ought to read *śriyābhijvalantāu*; cp. *śriyā jvalantam* 169, 25. Speyer translates freely.

XXII, 81. *aśaṅkitōktāiḥ praṇayākṣarāiḥ suhṛt*
karōti tuṣṭiṁ vibhavasthitasya yām |
na tadvidhāṁ lambhayatē sa tāṁ dhanāir
mahōpakāraḥ praṇayaḥ suhṛtsv ataḥ ||

Speyer's translation runs as follows: 'A friend expressing his wants in frank speech, causes a greater satisfaction to a wealthy man, than he could obtain from his riches. For this reason, unreservedness among friends is a great benefit'. Neither the text nor the translation can satisfy. The former must be faulty, because *tāṁ* is clearly pleonastic on account of *tadvidhāṁ* in the same line; the latter does not seem correct, because the causative shade of *lambhayatē* c as opposed to *karōti* b should not be neglected. A very slight correction enables us to restore perfect order. I read *taṁ* for *tāṁ* and translate the first three pādas as follows: 'Greater is the satisfaction which a friend expressing his wants in frank terms, prompted by love, causes to a wealthy man, than that which the latter (*sa*) causes to him (*taṁ*) by dint of his riches'. The idea is

common in Indian as well as in European literatures. Cp. the following stanza:

na tathā ratnam āsādya sujanaḥ paritusyati |
yathā tat tadgatākāṅkṣē pātrē dattvā prahṛṣyati ||

'A noble-minded man takes less delight in procuring a treasure than in bestowing it on a worthy person who has set his heart upon it'. (Bhāsa, Avimāraka, Act IV, v. 14).

XXIV, 42. *imaṁ viditvā nṛpa mitrapakṣē*
prabhāvasiddhī sadasatpravṛttyōḥ |
bhajasva mārgaṁ sujanābhipannaṁ
tēna prayātam anuyāti bhūtiḥ ||

Speyer says: 'Thus knowing the power and the consequences of good and evil behaviour with respect to friends, O king, hold fast to the road followed by the virtuous. He who goes along on this will attain happiness'. Now, as the text runs, *imaṁ* can be construed only with *mārgaṁ* which is extremely hard. Here again, a very slight and natural emendation viz. *imē* (agreeing with *prabhāvasiddhī*) will at once restore the correct construction as well as the logical connection with the foregoing. In fact, the power and the consequences of good behaviour with respect to friends have been spoken of in v. 41 while those of evil behaviour form the subject of the whole story and quite specially of v. 40. Speyer translates as if there were *ēvaṁ[viditvā* which is virtually the same as *imē.*

XXVII, 10cd. *svasaṁjñayā yūthaṃ athādidēśa*
drumād ataḥ śīghram abhiprayāyāt ||

„he ordered his tribe, making them a signal proper to his race, to come quickly off the tree" (Speyer). The peculiar construction of *liṅ* seems to me very suspected if not incorrect. We have a choice between several ways of emendation. Next at hand there is the imperative *abhiprayātāt* though its use here is a little exposed to syntactical objection (Whitney, Grammar § 571); *abhiprayāta* or *abhiprayāṇē* are likewise possible.

XXVIII, 25. *śubhasvabhāvātiśayaḥ prasiddhaḥ*
puṇyēna kīrtyā ca parā vivṛddhiḥ |
atōyasaṁparkakṛtā viśuddhis
tāis tāir guṇāughāiś ca parā samṛddhiḥ ||

The first pāda of this stanza should be restored to what seems to me the original wording, viz. °*tiśayā prasiddhiḥ*. This is proved (1) by the rhyme which appears at the end of every pāda in this as well as in the 26-th and 29-th stanzas, (2) by the fact that the predicative epithets of *kṣānti* (l. 7, above), itself a feminine, are feminines throughout the vv. 25—27, (but, of course, a masculine is possible).

XXVIII, 26 a. *parōparōdhēṣu sadānabhijñā*, 'always indifferent to injuries done to them by others' (Speyer). But can *anabhijña* alone have this meaning? I think not. Should we not read *madānabhijña*? I think, yes.

XXIX, 18. *yam ēva paśyanti tu savyapatrapaṁ*
śamābhijātaṁ vyavahāranāipuṇam |
ṛṇaṁ prayacchanti rahō 'pi tadvidhē
tadarpaṇaṁ hy abhyudayāvahaṁ dhanam ||

The last pāda is translated by Speyer 'such a bestowal of money produces bliss'. *tadarpaṇam*—a bahuvrīhi compound qualifying *dhanam* is grammatically correct, but it cannot be befended from the stylistical point of view, being in fact very clumsy. I think we ought to read *tadarpitaṁ* as shown by *gataṁ hi yat tatra* in the parallel stanza, above 17 d. Translate: 'for money bestowed on him (i. e. on such a man as described in ab) produces bliss'.

XXX, 31. *bhrātā nu tasyāiva mahādvipasya*
syād bāndhavō vānyatamō sutō vā |
tasyāiva khalv asya sitādriśōbhaṁ
saṁcūrṇitasyāpi vibhāti rūpam ||

tasyēva is most probably the correct reading for *tasyāiva*, c.

XXXI, 9. *hatapuruṣakalēvarākulaṁ*
rudhirasamukṣitarāudrabhūtalam |
puruṣam iva ruṣāvabhartsayat
sphuṭadahanāir aśivāiḥ śivārutāiḥ ||

The third pāda is translated by Speyer 'it seemed to threaten everyone'. But *puruṣa* cannot possibly have this meaning. I surmise that we ought to read *paruṣam* (adv.), though it may be granted that *avabhartsayat* should be construed rather with than without on object. The false reading is due to the influence of the first pāda.

225, 5/6. *rājakulē prajānurāgasāumukhyād askhalitābhivṛddhyā ca samṛddhyā samānatadṛptasāmantayā cābhivyājamānamahābhāgyē.* *samānatadṛptasāmantayā* cannot be a bahuvrīhi compound qualifying *samṛddhyā*, because *ca* shows that it is a substantive. I think that the reading of the text (perhaps due to a mere misprint) ought to be corrected into °*sāmantatayā*. Speyer seems to have translated accordingly. He says: 'which (viz. royal family), in consequence of their intentness on possessing the affection of their subjects, was manifested by their increasing prosperity and riches without hindrance, as well as by the submissiveness of their proud vassals'.

XXXII, 2 b. *parasparāślēṣavivṛttaharṣam* |

vivṛddha seems much better. Speyer's translation is very free.

XXX, 10 bc. *jalāni kṛtvā* | *mēghās*

A rather strange idiom. Should we read *sṛṣṭvā?* Speyer has: 'the clouds that poured out streams of water'.

XXXII, 28. *dōṣānurūpaṁ praṇayanti daṇḍaṁ*
kṛtāparādhēṣu nṛpāḥ pārēṣu |
mahāparādhē yadi mṛtyuśatrāu
na daṇḍanītipravaṇā bhavanti ||

The third pāda is thus rendered by Speyer: 'but if that enemy whose name is Death has greatly sinned against them'. This translation is certainly correct. But then it shows that *yadi* cannot be possibly good. The correct reading is doubtless *'pi tu.* In fact, *tu* often recurs in this set of parallel stanzas to which our stanza belongs; *'pi* is warranted by *vadhyē 'pi* 30 d, below.

XXXII, 41 ab. *imām avētyāprativāryaraudratāṁ*
kṛtāntaśatrōr bhavanē na mē matiḥ |

matiḥ, b, yields a pretty good meaning but *ratiḥ* is much better. Speyer's rendering shows that it is required by the sense: 'I am no longer pleased with the life at home'.

XXXIII, 3 c. *sa dharmasaṁjñī 'pi tu (karmalēśāṁs*
tāṁs tān samāsādya tathā tathāsīt) ||

Is *dharmasaṁjñī* a printer's error? It certainly ought to be corrected into *dharmasaṁjñō*, a bahuvrīhi that recurs on the

same page, l. 16. *hi* for *'pi* can also be thought of both particles being not seldom interchanged in careless MSS.

234, 21. *tēna hi na tvam asyāḥ kadācit prabādhanāyā mōkṣyasē* |
asya for *asyāḥ* seems to be more obvious; cp. v. 8 cd, above.

XXXIV, 19. *kṛtaś cēd dharma ity ēva*
kas tatrānuśayaḥ punaḥ |
atha pratyupakārārtham
ṛṇadānaṁ na tat kṛtam ||

kṛtaṁ is probably the genuine reading in the first pāda.

---

4. The epical poems of Aśvaghōṣa and the Divyāvadāna.

1. The collection of Buddhist legends known as the Divyāvadāna and edited by Cowell and Neil, Cambridge 1886, is no uniform work written by one single author. It was compiled from different sources by at least two but probably more writers. The whole thus bearing the character of a compilation its various portions cannot be assigned to one definite epoch. The date of each story or cycle of stories has to be examined separately. So it is the aim of the following lines to fix the terminus ante quem non of the interesting cycle of legends which relate to Aśōka's history and are given as Nss. XXVI—XXIX of the collection bearing in their respective colophons the titles Pāṁśupradānāvadāna, Kunāla°, Vītaśōka° and Aśōka°. A simple perusal of these stories shows however that the subdivision mentioned above is purely arbitrary. After all we have to do with one great legend extending over pp. 348—434, which, for all one feels tempted to say about its internal incoherence, may fairly lay claim to be called simply Aśōkāvadāna or the Legend of Aśōka.

The terminus ante quem non of this cycle of Aśōka-legends can be assured beyond any doubt by the indisputable fact of its author having known both the epical poems of Aśvaghōṣa, the Buddhacarita and the Sāundarananda.

Prof. Leumann was the first to point out that a stanza occurring in the former poem is quoted in a somewhat corrupt form in the Kunālāvadāna of our collection. It reads as follows:

tatō nṛpas tasya niśāmya bhāvaṁ
putrābhidhānasya manōrathasya |
snēhāc ca yōgyaṁ manasā ca buddhvā
ājñāpayāmāsa vihāya yātrām || [1])

Divyāvadāna p. 408 1 ff.

Now there is always the possibility of interpolation to be considered whenever a single stanza of an earlier poem is quoted anonymously in a later work. But in this case interpolation cannot be thought of as the immediately following prose is a palpable paraphrase of the immediately following stanzas of the Buddhacarita. For convenience' sake both passages are given here on parallel columns:

atha rājāśōkō nagaraśōbhāṁ mārgaśōbhāṁ ca kṛtvā jīrṇāturakṛpaṇāṁś ca mārgād apanīya ēkarathē 'bhiruhya kumārēṇa saha Pāṭaliputrān nirgataḥ |

Divyāv. 408, 5—7.

nivartayāmāsa sa rājamārgē
saṁpātam ārtasya pṛthagjanasya |
mā bhūt kumāraḥ sukumāracittaḥ
saṁvignacētā iti manyamānaḥ ||
pratyaṅgahīnān vikalēndriyāṁś ca
jīrṇāturādīn kṛpaṇāṁś ca bhikṣūn |
tataḥ samutsārya parēṇa sāmnā
śōbhāṁ parāṁ rājapathasya cakruḥ ||

BC. III, 4. 5. [2]).

It should be noticed that the prose quoted above is an essential part of the story and cannot be left out without serious prejudice to the whole of it.

Having thus gained a strong footing we may proceed to examine other similar reminiscences. If considered along with the above case they must appear much more convincing than taken alone.

First, there is a stanza occurring in an abstract of Buddha's life supposed to be told by the Sthavira Upagupta, which bears

---

[1]) In the Buddhacarita we find *niśamya* in the first pāda. The second half of the stanza runs differently viz.

snēhasya lakṣmyā vayasaś ca yōgyām
ājñāpayāmāsa vihārayātrām ||

ajñā° found in the text of Divyāv. is of course a printer's error.

[2]) The Buddhacarita is quoted from my own edition of that poem, ready in MS.

clear traces of having been influenced by a similar stanza of the Buddhacarita. The metre is the same. Cp.:

vinirmitābhā kanakāvadātā	*yasmin prasūtē girirājakīlā*
sāindrē trilōkē nayanābhirāmā |	*vātāhatā nāur iva bhūś cacāla* ||
sasāgarāntā ca mahī saśāilā	*sacandanā cōtpalapadmagarbhā*
mahārṇavasthāiva nāu[1]) *cacāla* ||	*papāta vṛṣṭir gaganād anabhrāt* ||
Divyāv. 390, 9—8 f. b.	BC. I, 40.

Cp. also the following stanza giving a description of Rājagṛha on the occasion of Buddha's entrance into that capital:

lavaṇajalanivāsinī tatō vā
nagaranigamamaṇḍitā saśāilā |
municaraṇanipīḍitā ca bhūmī
pavanabalābhihatēva yānapātram ||
Divyāv. 365, 17—18.

It is perhaps worth mentioning that the epithet *kanakāvadāta* 'pure as gold' met with in the first of the two stanzas quoted above as well as in the preceding one[2]) is also found in Canto I of the Buddhacarita not very far from the stanza just quoted from that poem [3]). The Lalitavistara (ed. Lefmann) has *kanakagirinikāsa*, 92, 12.

Again, there is a passage met with on the next following page of the Divyāvadāna which reminds us of some parallel stanzas of the Buddhacarita. Of course the current Buddha legend (s. Lalitavistara 128/9) is greatly responsible for the coincidence but the direct influence of the Buddhacarita appears highly probable if viewed in the light of the fact discussed above. I let follow both passages arranged on parallel columns:

asmin pradēśē Bōdhisattvō jīr-	*samavāptamanaḥsthitiś ca sadyō*
ṇāturamṛtasaṁdarśanōdvignō	*viṣayēcchādibhir ādhibhiś ca muktaḥ* |
vanaṁ saṁśritaḥ | *asmin pra-*	*savitarkavicāram āpa śāntaṁ*

[1]) Sic MSS. The corresponding passages of the Lalitavistara are *yatha ca cali sasāgarā mēdinī*, 92, 3 and *trisahasrā iyaṁ bhūmiḥ kampatē sacarācarā*, 93, 7.

[2]) *mayā hi dṛṣṭaḥ kanakāvadātaḥ*
prajāyamānō dvipadapradhānaḥ | Divyāv. 390.

[3]) *samudbhavan sō 'pi ca mātṛkukṣēḥ* |
... cakāra lōkaṁ kanakāvadātam || BC. I, 26.

dēśē jambūcchāyāṁ niṣadya viviktaṁ pāpakāir akuśalāir dharmāiḥ savitarkaṁ savicāraṁ vivēkajaṁ prītisukham anāśravasadṛśaṁ prathamadhyānaṁ samāpannaḥ |
Divyāv. 391, 13—16.

prathamaṁ dhyānam anāsravaprakāram ||
adhigamya tatō vivēkajaṁ tu paramaprītisukhaṁ samādhijanyam |
idam ēva tataḥ paraṁ pradadhyāu manasā lōkagatiṁ niśamya samyak ||
BC. V 10. 11.[1]).

The Lalitavistara (p. 129) has not the word *anāśravasadṛśam* = *anāsravaprakāram.*

In that portion of the great Aśōka legend which is intitulated Kunālāvadāna there is somewhere told of a boy newly born to a certain Gupta, a perfumer, that as far as beauty is concerned he exceeded simple mortals but did not equal gods:

yāvad Guptasya gāndhikasya tṛtīyaḥ putrō jātō 'bhirūpō darśanīyaḥ prāsādikō 'tikrāntō mānuṣavarṇam asaṁprāptaś ca divyavarṇam |
Divyāvadāna 352, 1—3.

Now boys and girls are born almost in every legend of our collection. Most of them are generally no less than mere wonders of beauty. And yet their superiority is nowhere stated in so elegant a manner as just here. As far as I am aware the expression of somebody 'being more than a man but less than a god' is not met with elsewhere in Indian literature, at least not in this concise but pregnant form, except in Sāundarananda IV, 6:

sā dēvatā nandanacāriṇīva
kulasya nandījananaś ca Nandaḥ |
atītya martyān anupētya dēvān
sṛṣṭāv abhūtām iva bhūtadhātrā ||

It seems to me that we cannot but assume a direct influence of Aśvaghōṣa on the other author.

The influence thus stated is probably borne out by some circumstances of less importance. There are some two or three words

[1]) The Divyāvadāna proceeds to tell us of the well-known miracle of the motionless shadow (s. Lalitavistara p. 132) which does not occur in the Buddhacarita. It is perhaps worth noticing that the same miracle is mentioned later on in connexion with a boy called Śyāmaka, both passages being almost identical. Prof. Hertel has shown that this is no particular trace of Buddhism but ought to be regarded as generally Indian. Cp. his Pañcatantra (Leipzig, Teubner 1914) p. 374.

and forms rather peculiar to the author of the Buddhacarita that seem to occur in the Aśōka portion of the Divyāvadāna but not elsewhere throughout the entire collection [1]). Such are:

sarvaprajānām ayam antakarmā, BC. III 59 b (which, however, can be corrected to *idam antakarma*); *nāyaṁ tātasyāśōkasya karmā*, Divyāv. 412, 3 f. b.

arya (with short *a*) BC. VIII, 34 c (in *aryaputra*); Divyāv. 399, 12, both forms being secured by metre.

Māra is called *kāmapracārādhipati* [2]) BC. XIII 2 c. In the Divyāv. he bears the epithet of *kāmadhātvadhipati*, 359, 9.

There is also a verbal form met with in Divyāv. which deserves mentioning in this connexion. In a portion of that work specially conspicuous for traces of the influence of the Buddhacar. we read:

nirupasthāyakō vīraḥ praviṣṭāikas tapōvanam ||
p. 391, ślōka.

praviṣṭāikas is probably best explained as *praviṣṭa(ḥ)ēkas*, through *saṁdhir ārṣaḥ*. Nevertheless it reminds one of *praviṣṭā* (periphr. future) BC. V 84 d, a form which has been rejected as false by Böhtlingk.

Thus we are forced to the conclusion that the author or compiler of legends XXVI—XXIX of the Divyāvadāna must have lived after Aśvaghōṣa. He was surely acquainted with the works of that poet.

It might be added that the word *dīnāra* which does not appear in India before the second century A. D. occurs twice in this portion of the Divyāvadāna viz. 427, 13 and 434, 12 while it is not found in the remaining stories. The inference is perhaps permitted that the main mass of the legends is older than the second century A. D. But of course an argumentum ex silentio cannot be decisive. At any rate the cycle of legends concerned with the person of Aśōka does contrast with the main bulk of

---

[1]) Of course I cannot speak with complete assurance. The Divyāv. extending over more than 650 pages of small print I may have failed in discovering all coincidences.

[2]) Prof. Minayev conjectures *kāmāvacārādhipati* in his Очеркъ фонетики и морфологіи языка Пали.

the Divyāvadāna by its rather flowery style and artificial exteriors.

2. In the remaining stories of the Divyāvadāna the influence of Aśvaghōṣa's poetry is limited to some stray passages. In one or two of them it is however beyond dispute. So f. i.

tṛṣṇānilāiḥ śōkaśikhāpracaṇḍāiś
cittāni dagdhāni bahuprakāram |
āśāvatām sapraṇayābhirāmāir
dānāmbuṣēkāiḥ śamayāmbabhūva ||
Divyāv. 586, 6—4 f. b.

Māyāpi taṁ kukṣigataṁ dadhānā
vidyudvilāsaṁ jaladāvalīva |
dānāmbuṣēkāiḥ paritō janānāṁ
dāridryatāpaṁ śamayāmbabhūva || [1])
BC. I, 22.

Chance coincidence is hardly admissible. It is directly impossible in the case of the following stanza of the Buddhacarita:

dṛṣṭvā ca taṁ rājasutaṁ striyas tā
jājvalyamānaṁ vapuṣā śriyā ca |
dhanyāsya bhāryēti śanāir avōcañ
śuddhāir manōbhiḥ khalu nānyabhāvāt ||
III. 23.

The stanza refers to Siddhārtha's first pleasure-tour through the streets of Kapilavāstu. Now, a certain king Candraprabha, on a similar occasion, is greeted in exactly the same manner by the women of his capital. The passage runs as follows:

rājā Candraprabhō yēna yēnāvalōkayati tēna tēna strīsahasrāṇy avalōkayanti | *dhanyās tāḥ striyō yēṣām ēṣa bhartēti* | *tac ca śuddhāir manōbhir nānyathābhāvāt* [2]) | *ēvaṁ darśanīyō rājā Candraprabhō babhūva* |

Divyāv. 318, 13—16.

The influence of the Buddhacarita is palpable.

Now, both passages quoted above occur in legends distinguished for a pretty careful, not to say artificial style, much in the same manner as those legends that relate to Aśōka's history. So then we come to the conclusion that legends XXXVIII and XXII of the Divyāvadāna are later than Aśvaghōṣa.

[1]) *śamayāmbabhūva* wit C (= CD) and Bt prima manu in margin.
[2]) Probably corrupt for *nānyabhāvāt*.

Another inference to be drawn from what has been said thus far is that the Buddhacarita was better and more widely known to the compilers of the Divyāvadāna than the Sāundarananda. But I must admit that it is also better known to myself which makes discovering of coincidences specially easy.

Appendix.

The late Prof. Speyer has drawn attention to a passage occurring in one of the Aśōka legends of the Divyāvadāna in which a description of a dramatic representation — it is called *nāṭaka* — is given [1]). Mr. Huizinga in whose well-known book on the Vidūṣaka Prof. Speyer's observation is to be found, seems to attach an undue importance to that passage, even if one considers that he knew nothing definite about the date of the Divyāvadāna. He certainly exaggerates when he says: Deze plaats is als gegeven voor den ouderdom van het drama naast de plaatsen uit Pâṇini vooraal daarom van zoo groote warde, omdat hier het woord *nâṭaka* zelf voorkomt, dat absoluut bewijst, dat men met een feitelijk tooneelspeel te doen heeft, terwijl *naṭa*, waar het voorkomt, bij sommigen altijd nog den twijfel kan laten bestaan, of men werkelijk aan tooneelspelers moet denken [2]). The word *nāṭaka* used in the passage quoted above, foot-note [1]), can teach us nothing about dramatic representations in olden times, since the legend in which it occurs is later than Aśvaghōṣa. Nevertheless there is an inference to be drawn from it. It has been considered doubtful whether the word *nāṭaka* as occurring in the Mahābhārata and Rāmāyaṇa has the same technical meaning as later on or serves only to denote

[1]) *yāvat tṛtīyē 'pi divasē sthavirōpaguptaḥ pūrvakālakaraṇīyāṁ kathāṁ kṛtvā satyāny ārabdhaḥ saṁprakāśayituṁ Mārēṇa ca nātidūrē nāṭakam ārabdhaṁ divyāni ca vādyāni saṁpravāditāni, divyāś cāpsarasō nāṭayituṁ pravṛttāḥ | yāvad vītarāgō janakāyō divyāni rūpāṇi dṛṣṭvā divyāṁś ca śabdāñ śrutvā Mārēṇākṛṣṭaḥ | atō Mārēṇōpaguptasya parṣad ākṛṣṭā prītimanasā Mārēṇa sthavirōpaguptasya śirasi mālā baddhā.* (p. 357, 11—19).

[2]) J. Huizinga, De Vidūṣaka en het indisch tooneel, Groningen 1897, p. 14.

a kind of popular entertainments of a baser sort[1]). Here we see that after Aśvaghōṣa i. e. at a time when the classical drama was in full blossom, the word *nāṭaka* is still used in a rather ambiguous sense. For despite Mr. Huizinga's assertion the only conclusion we can reasonably draw from the passage in question is that a *nāṭaka* was a kind of dancing academy accompanied by instrumental music. So it is doubly strange that Speyer has neglected to draw Mr. Huizinga's attention to another particular proving past all doubt that the *nāṭaka* hinted at in the said passage presupposes the existence of real actors availing themselves of costumes and other paraphernalia of dramatic characterisation. I mean the word *nēpathya* 'costume, rôle'. It is used twice viz.:

> *Māra uvāca | tēna hi mamāpi samayaḥ śrūyatām |*
> *sahasā tam ihōdvīkṣya Buddhanēpathyadhāriṇam |*
> *na praṇāmas tvayā kāryaḥ sarvajñagurugāuravāt ||*
> p. 360, 7—5 f. b.

and again:

> *Māraś ca vanagahanam anupraviśya Buddharūpaṁ kṛtvā naṭa iva saruciranēpathyas tasmād vanagahanād ārabdhō niṣkramitum |*
> p. 361, 8—10.

---

5. Critical Notes on the Sāundarananda.

The Sāundarananda of Aśvaghōṣa has been edited in 1910 (Bibliotheca Indica N. S., 1251) by Mr. Haraprasāda Śāstrī from two Nepal MSS, an older (XII cent.) and a younger one (XVIII cent.). At first sight, the printed text of our poem makes a pretty smooth appearance especially when compared to that of the Buddhacarita. And yet it is scarcely better preserved. I am glad to admit that the editor has done his best to prepare a readable text. The conscientious accuracy displayed by him in deciphering the

---

[1]) For a discussion of these problems see my forthcoming essay in Polish on the Origin of the Indian Drama and the Question of Greek Influence.

dilapidated MSS. cannot be appreciated too highly. On the other hand he is no less commendable for having abstained from too many conjectural readings. In fact, conjectures always bear a stamp of subjectivity and ought rather to be avoided in an editio princeps. Later on they are indispensable and their growing amount should be sifted to the bottom by subsequent editors. In my opinion, every reader of the first edition of a difficult work should try to contribute to the final elucidation of the text. In that view I prepared a pretty long list of conjectural suggestions to numerous passages of the Sāundarananda. It was for some time ready for print when Prof. Hultzsch was kind enough to send me his very valuable paper 'Zu Aśvaghōsha's Saundarananda' (ZDMG 1918, v. 72 pp. 111—144)[1]). A considerable number of my corrections having been made accessible by the learned professor who found them independently of me, I was obliged to delay printing in order to recast the original manuscript of my little treatise. It now appears in a new form and I can only hope that some at least of my unpretending suggestions will be approved of by the Sanskrit scholars.

Canto I.

NB. I was unable to have a look at M. Baston's translation of this and the next canto.

27 c. (*tad vanaṁ muninā tēna tāiś ca kṣatriyapuṅgavāiḥ* |)
śāntāṁ guptāṁ ca yugapad (*brahmakṣatraśriyaṁ dadhē* ||)

Read *śāntaṁ guptaṁ ca*. It is the forest that is appeased and protected, but not the abstract *śrī*. 'That forest calm as it was on account of that muni living in it and well-guarded by the presence of those noble heroes, assumed a kind of beauty significant at once of both the brahman and the kshatriya castes'.

31 c *tadāśramamahīṁ yāṁ tu* cannot be good. *yāṁ* has probably to be changed to *tāṁ* (the same correction is proposed by Prof. Hultzsch). Now, *tad° tāṁ* cannot but be called very clumsy.

---

[1]) I could no more utilise his twin paper 'Zu Aśvaghōsha's Buddhacharita' (ibid., pp. 145—156) for my second series of corrections to the BC. It came too late.

But *tadā* — *tāṁ* is no less clumsy because of *tataḥ*, a (cp. Hultzsch ad IV, 22). Shall we read *sadāśrama°*?

35 d. The words *vyāyatā viddhavāsasaḥ* seem to have been unduly separated by the editor.

37 b. The words *vṛddhān vyāghraśiśūn iva* contain a contradictio in adiecto. I should like to read *kruddhān*.

50 c. *nājñayā cētanōtkarṣāt*. I am not sure whether the change suggested by Prof. Hultzsch viz. *akṣayāś* be really needed. The meaning appears to be: 'Not directed by anybody to do so but prompted by his superior intelligence'.

p. 8 l. 11. Read *Kapilavāstu°* and cp. Hultzsch ad 57 d, supra.

Canto II.

8 d. *yō'sya*. Read *yasya*, the long series of relative pronouns vv. 5—9 referring to the king; besides it is better style.

13 a. *dhṛtyārakṣīt pratijñāṁ sa sadvājīvōdyatāṁ dhuram* |
The editor's paper MS. (i. e. the younger one) has *arākṣīt*. Read *avākṣīt* which, by the bye, is preferable on account of b. *arakṣīt* occurs infra, 15 c.

17 a. *apyāsīt duḥkhitān paśyan*. It is very little probable that *pyā* should be a transitive parasmāipadi as Prof. Hultzsch would have it. Besides *duḥkhitān* depends on *paśyan* which will lose any meaning if its object be construed with another verb. Either *amlāsīt* or *aglāsīt* would seem preferable. Both are used in VI, 34 a (*rurōda mamlāu virurāva jaglāu*).

20 a. *nāsṛkṣat kalim aprāptam*.
Read: *balim* as in Buddhacarita II, 44 a (*na cājihīrṣīd balim apravṛttam*). Cp. also I 56; II 17, 27.

22 cd. *parasvaṁ bhuvi nāmṛkṣan mahāviṣam ivāu(vō)ragam* |
The editor's change of *uragam* to *āuragam* is quite superfluous. *mahāviṣam* is used as a bahuvrīhi compound.

23 a. *nākrakṣad viṣayē tasya kaścit*.
Read: *nākrukṣat*. Printer's error?

24 c. (*kṛtāgasō 'pi praṇatān prāg ēva priyakāriṇaḥ* |)
ādarśasnigdhayā dṛṣṭyā (*ślakṣṇēna vacasāsicat* ||)
Read: *adarśat snigdhayā dṛṣṭyā*.

31 d. Read *sasyam* for *sasvam*.

39 ab. *tējasā ca tviṣā cāiva ripūn dṛptān avībhasat* |
The paper MS has *avīhasat.* Prof. Hultzsch surmises *abībhayat.* I think that some verb like *adīdahat* would much better suit the first half-line. *dah* in the sense of *ji* is a metaphor not unfrequent in classical Sanskrit. That king Śuddhōdana was not content with frightening his 'insolent foes' but sought to crush them, appears from another verse of the same Canto, viz. *jitvā dṛptān api ripūn,* 41 c.

43 d. (*vipriyapriyayōḥ kṛtyē*) *na tēnāgāmi nikriyā* ||
Read: *vikriyā* and cp. III 19 d (*na jagāma duḥkhasukhayōś ca* [Hultzsch] *vikriyām*). The word is frequent enough: VIII, 2 c; IX, 59 a; Buddhacar. III, 28 d.

45 c. *aśakyaśakyasāmantaḥ* (*Śākyarājaḥ sa Śakravat* ||)
Prof. Hultzsch reads: *aśakyaśakta°.* I think *°śakra°* is preferable on account of the anuprāsa; it has the same meaning as *śakta,* cp. Buddhacar. III, 42 d.

55 a. *cāiva* is better than *cēva.*

56 a. I should have preferred *yaśaḥkētuḥ* to *yaśaḥkētum.*

64 c. The metre is too puzzled to allow any sure correction. Anyhow, *jātaparamaśaṅkō* seems better than *gata°.*

Canto III.

5 d. *bubhujē narānnam amṛtatvabuddhayē* |
narānnam is probably only a slip of the pen for *varānnam.*

21 a. *Sugatas tathāgatam apēkṣya narapatim.*
Read: *avēkṣya* just as infra, 26 a *atha bhājanīkṛtam avēkṣya manujapatim.* The two passages are closely parallel. Buddha first saw his father unworthy (v. 21) and then worthy of instruction (v. 26). As a rule it is *ava-īkṣ* that is used by our poet to convey the idea of 'looking on', cp. IV, 20 b; 22 c; IX, 4 a and so on.

31 d. *bhujagād ivānyavibhavād vivivyathē* ||
I should prefer to read *hi vivyathē.* Te particle *hi* had rather not to be missed, see the next verse (*paramā hi tā,* Hultzsch). *vyath* not *vi-vyath* is found supra, II, 2 d.

42 c. *°dāiśikē.* — Already Böhtlingk remarked that it is rather strange that Aśvaghōṣa should have used the two forms *dāiśika* and *dēśika* in two consecutive pādas of the same stanza (ad

Buddhacar. XIII, 62). And yet it is hardly due to case that both in this poem and in the Buddhacar. the simple word has only the form *dāiśika* while *dēśika* is used only in the compound *sudēśika*. Cp. *dāiśika*, Sāund. III, 42 c; XIII, 28 d; XVIII, 41 a; Buddhacar. XIII, 62 c; *sudēśika*, Sāund. XVIII, 8 d; 50 d; Buddhacar. XIII, 62 d.

Canto IV.

15 c. *bhavēc ca ruṣṭā kila nāma tasmāi.*

This looks suspected. Several guesses can be made but I am unable to choose between them. *bhūtvā ca?*

22 b. (*Nandas tatō darpaṇam ādarēṇa*)
bibhrat tadā maṇḍanasākṣibhṛtam |

Prof. Hultzsch reads *tadāmaṇḍanasācibhūtam* and construes *tad* with *vadanam* in d. Now, *bhṛta* is doubtless no more than a printer's error for *bhūtam* just as *bhṛṣaṇaṁ*, supra, 12 d. *tadā maṇḍana°* is falsely separated instead of *tad-āmaṇḍana°*. So far, then, I can agree with Prof. Hultzsch. But *°sākṣi°* is quite correct. The mirror was of course witness of Sundarī's toilet. As to the short *-i* I can only remark that Aśvaghōṣa is very careful about distinguishing nominal and verbal compounds ending in *bhūta*, cp. for instance *kūrmībhūta* 'one that became a tortoise' but *paṇyabhūta* 'that which is (or was, as the case may be) a merchandise' XI, 45 d; 26 d. Cp. also *sākṣikuruṣva*, XVI, 26 b.

35 d. *vibōdhayēyaṁ ca na cālayēyam.*

A second *ca* is missed. Besides, *cālayēyam* is rather pale and says nothing. Read: *cālapēyam*, i. e. *ca ālapēyam*. Sundarī speaks as a loving coquette should be expected to speak.

36 b. (*athāpy anāśyānaviśēṣakāyāṁ*) *apy ēṣyasi*

This is of course quite wrong, *api-api* cannot be good and the bahuvrīhi compound in a demands a subject. Read: *mayy ēṣyasi* as shown by numerous passages referring to ours, cp. VII 19 a (and my note thereto, infra, ad locum); VI, 13 d.

36 d. Should we read *vibhūṣitēna* (viz. *bhujadvayēna*) for *vibhūṣaṇēna?*

37 b. (*ity ēvam uktaś ca nipīḍitaś ca*)
tayā sa vēṇusvanayā jagāma |

But the next half-line contains Nanda's answer to the entreating words of his wife. He is not yet going, nay, he cannot go being still embraced by Sundarī (supra 33 a: *sā parisasvajē tam*, and 37 a: *nipīḍitaś ca tayā*). *jagāma* must be corrected to *jagāda*.

43 ab. *adarśanaṁ bhūyagataś ca tasyā*
harmyāt tataś cāvatatāra tūrṇam |

Prof. Hultzsch reads: *adarśanībhūya gataś ca tasyā*. He is no doubt quite right in correcting °*naṁ* to °*nī*. But a change of subject must be indicated by the corresponding personal pronoun. So I should like to read:

adarśanībhūya gatē ca tasmin
harmyāt tataḥ sāvatatāra tūrṇam |

The change cannot be said too violent for a Nepal MS and the text has gained in fluency of style.

Canto V.

3 c. *tutas tatra* — „Wohl ein blosser Druckfehler für *tatas tatra*" says Prof. Hultzsch. But if not, then *tu tat tatra* is likewise possible and just as good. Cp. *snēhāstadā* (paper MS.) for *snēhāt tayā* VI, 44 b.

8 d. *gr̥hasya kakṣā[n] mahatō 'bhyasūyan* ||

This is a conjecture of the editor's. The MSS. read: *kakṣyāmahatō* (palm leaf) and *kakṣāmahatō* (paper). Either of these variants being preferable to the printed text, the Buddhacarita decides in favour of the first and older one (*gr̥hakakṣyāṁ prathamaṁ vinirjagāma* || V, 67 d). As to the form of the compound it is familiar to our poet, cp. *āryasya ārambhamahataḥ* II, 61 c; *abhijanamahatō manasvinaḥ* VIII, 57 a; *śrutamahatā śramaṇēna* IX, 50 b. This kind of tatpuruṣa compounds is common to elegant style. Cp. the following remark of Bühler: 'Jedenfalls schien dem Dichter (= Hariṣēṇa) das einfachere und natürlichere *prasabhōddharaṇalabdhamahāprabhāvasya* zu trivial und er wählte deshalb das künstlichere °*prasabhōddharaṇōdvr̥ttaprabhāvamahataḥ*'. (Die indischen Inschriften etc. Wien 1890, p. 43).

10 a. *ity ēvam uktaḥ praṇayēna tēna*

praṇatēna seems better on account of *nanāma*, supra, 6 d, and °*unmukhalōcanēna*, infra, b.

15 c. *klēśākulān [tān] viṣayān sa tāñ ca*

I surmise *ca pañca* on account of the senses being five in number. Cp. the numerals in the next stanza.

25 c. *jñānāya kṛtyaṁ paramaṁ priyābhyaḥ*

This is sheer nonsense. Read: *kriyābhyaḥ*. Printer's error?

31 c. *tathānapēkṣyōjitalōkamōhō*

anapēkṣyō is decidedly out of place here. As *kṣa* and *kṣya* freely interchange in the MSS. of both this poem and the Buddhacar., we have full right to read *anapēkṣōjita°* which in order to yield a satisfactory meaning must be corrected either to *anapēkṣājita°* or to *anapēkṣōjjhita°*.

37 d. *(jñātīṁś ca dṛṣṭvā vratinō gṛhasthān)*
saṁvin na cittē 'sti na vāsti cētaḥ ||

A pronoun referring to Nanda being wanted I suggest the correction
saṁvin na kiṁ tē 'sti na vāsti cētaḥ ||

It is the same *tē* which recurs in the immediately following stanzas 38 a, 39 c, 40 b. Cp. also VI, 40 b (same construction as in 38 a, above) and P. M. ad locum. The phrase *saṁvin na kiṁ tē 'sti* is repeated in VIII, 49 b (*na tu saṁvid asti tē*).

39 d. *(nāivāsti mōktuṁ matir ālayaṁ tē)*
dēśaṁ mumūrṣōr iva sōpasargam ||

This is well nigh unintelligible. Moribund men are not likely to think of going abroad. Read probably: *mumukṣōr*, 'Are you not willing to abandon your house as one wishes to abandon a country infested by calamities?' Another possible emendation is: *dēhaṁ mumūrṣōr iva*, but I think *upasarga* is an attribute of a country rather than of the body. Besides, the first argument appears to be more natural considering that Nanda was a worldly youth not like to meditate on the problem of death but attached to life and its contingencies.

41 d. *(yaḥ sarvatō vēśmani dahyamānē*
śayīta mōhān na tatō vyapēyāt |
kālāgninā vyādhijarāśikhēna)
lōkē pradīptē sa bhavēt pramattaḥ ||

Shall we read: *prasannaḥ*? The correction is so slight! Only a man who would not abandon a burning house is like to keep quiet

(*bhavēt prasannaḥ*) when the world is consumed by conflagration. *pramattaḥ* appears to be due to *mattō* and *pramādyan* in the next stanza, if not to mere misreading.

46 a. *varaṁ hitōdarkam aniṣṭam annaṁ*
(*na svādu yat syād ahitānubaddham* |)

Only *amiṣṭam* does correspond with *svādu*. Cp. XI, 16 d; 22 b. *aniṣṭam*, infra 48 a is correct being opposed to *pratikūlam*, c.

47 b. (*bālasya dhātrī vinigṛhya lōṣṭraṁ*)
yathōddharaty ātmapuṭapraviṣṭam |

Read: *āsyapuṭa°*. Cp. *vivṛtāsyapuṭāḥ*, Buddhacar. V, 61 a.

52 a. *athō rutaṁ tasya mukhaṁ sabāṣpam.*

Read: *athō nataṁ*, as Nanda's head was necessarily bent down while Ānanda was cutting his hair. Besides, the correction is indispensable in order to make the simile complete, *nataṁ mukham* = *vakrāgranālaṁ nalinam.* Prof. Hultzsch has rendered *rutam* by 'klagend' which, however, is pleonastic on account of *sabāṣpaṁ* and, moreover, very hard, *ruta* being almost unused as an adjective. Finally, let us remark that *ruta* cannot be referred to the vedic root *ru* 'to break', unknown in classical Skt. and 'not unquestionable' even in the Veda (Whitney; Roots etc. s. v.).

Canto VI.

5 d. (*tiryak ca śiśyē pravikīrṇahārā*)
sapādukāivārdhavilambapādā ||

It is good English to say that a girl is shaking in her shoes, but it is not equally good Sanskrit to call special attention (*ēva*!) to the fact of her wearing slippers at a moment of distress. So I should venture to read *sapādukāikārdha°*. As Sundarī was lying slant on a sofa, her one foot, shod in a slipper, was half hanging down. The attention being thus drawn to that one foot, it is quite natural that it has got an epithet.

6 a. *athātra kācit pramadā sabāṣpāṁ*
(*tāṁ duḥkhitāṁ draṣṭum abhīpsamānā* [Hultzsch] |)

I suppose *sabāṣpā* (Nomin.) to make it oppose *duḥkhitām* (Accus.). Such slight opposition is, as a rule, peculiar to good style, cp. e. g. *sasmāra tām aśrumukhīṁ sabāṣpaḥ*, VII, 6 c. In v. 20 d, infra,

the same servant is referred to as *sā strī sabāṣpā* 'that crying woman'.

12 b. (*sā strīsvabhāvēna vicintya tat tat*)
dṛṣṭānurāgē 'bhimukhē 'pi patyāu |
(*dharmāśritē tattvam avindamānā*)

abhimukhē appears strange as just the contrary is expected. I should propose to read: *vimukhē*. Sundarī was thinking of her husband whose love she could not doubt (*dṛṣṭānurāgē*) although (*api*) — for the moment — he turned away from her (*vimukhē*). The truth did not occur to her viz. that he took the vows.

15 c. *tathā hi rāgō yadi tasya hi syāt*

hi-hi cannot be possibly correct. *tathā hi* is doubtless due to *tathā hi*, infra, 16 c. Read probably: *tathāiva* 'if his affection were just so (as it was before) i. e. unchanged'. *tathā virāgo* (cp. *hṛdayaṁ viraktam*, supra, 15 b) *yadi tasya na syāt* is likewise possible but no doubt less good since *hi* cannot be missing as shown by 16 c, 17c

17 d. (*munāu prasādō yadi tasya hi syān*)
mṛtyōr ivōgrād anu tat vibhīyāt ||

This is void of any meaning. One should expect an ablative depending on *bibhīyāt* and making the simile (*iva*) complete. Shall we read: *nanu mad?*

18 a. *lēkhārtham ādarśam ananyacittō*
(*vibhūṣayantyā mama dhārayitvā* |)

lēkhārtham has been conjectured by the editor for *lēvārtham* of his MS. But I am not aware that either *lēkha* or *lēkhā* can be used without further ceremony as synonymous with *viśēṣaka* and so I should like to read *sēvārtham*; cp. *siṣēviṣuḥ* in the very scene of the mirror hinted at by Sundarī, IV, 12 b.

22 a. *mā svāminaṁ svāmini dōṣam āgāḥ*

The double accusative depending on *ā-gā* (transitive?) is doubtless wrong. Read: *dōṣatō gāḥ*. The construction is familiar to Aśvaghōṣa. Cp. III, 34 c (*asukhatō vimṛśan*); VIII, 48 cd (*śubhatō gacchasi*); Buddhacar. VIII, 49 (*dōṣatō gantum* as restored by myself ad XI, 57 and by Prof. Hultzsch ad locum).

43 d. *kiṁ viklavē rōdiṣi harṣakālē?*

There is no reason to prefer the reading *viklavā* as Prof. Hultzsch does. *viklavē* is better warranted (palm leaf MS) and yields an excellent meaning. It is of course Voc. Sing.

Canto VII.

1 a. *liṅgaṁ tataś cāstu vidhipradiṣṭaṁ*
(gātrēṇa bibhran na tu cētasā tat |)

cāstu is apparently false. Shall we read: *cāsya*, or: *cātma°*?

3 cd. *bhṛśaṁ jajṛmbhē yugadīrghabāhur*
dhyātvā priyāṁ cāpam ivācakarṣa ||
4 ab. *sa pātakakṣōdam iva pratīccha[n]*
cūtadrumēbhyas tanupuṣpavarṣam |

This looks extremely suspected. The words *jajṛmbhē* and *cāpam ivācakarṣa* as well as the mentioning of *cūta* flowers seem to point to Kāma, the God of Love, who was torturing Nanda (cp. Buddha's final words to Nanda: *nirjitya Māraṁ yudhi durnivāram adyāsi lōkē raṇaśā[stra]śūraḥ*, XVIII, 28). But I am unable to restore 3 cd. As to 4 a, *pātaka* might stand for *sāyaka*, but what of *kṣōdam?* Shall we read *kṣōbham? kṣēpam? pātam?* Nothing is sure.

4 d. *navagrahō nāga ivāvabuddhaḥ ||*

Read: *ivāvaruddhaḥ* and cp. my note to Buddhacar. IX, 6 d (Rocznik Oryentalistyczny I, 1).

16 b. Read *rāukṣyaṁ* as in the immediately preceding stanza, 15 c.

13 a. *yathāiṣy anāśyānaviśēṣakāyāṁ*
(mayīti yan māṁ avadac ca sāśru |)

yathā is neither here nor there. I should like to read *atha* in order to make the quotation more exact: 'But if you come back, before the paint on my cheek is dry...', cp. IV, 36 a and my note thereto.

22 d. Correct: *caṅkramyamāṇāya.*

29 c. *atō 'sya yasyāṁ suṣuvē mahātmā Dvāipāyanō*

This is doubtless wrong. Read: *sutō 'sya* and cp. e. g. *yasyām... sutaḥ prasūtō 'sya*, supra, 28 cd. or *yatra* (= *yasyāṁ* i. e. *Sarasvatyām*)

sutō 'sya jajñē, infra, 31 c. Cp. also *sutō* for *ato* Buddhacar. XI, 63a (Windisch).

37 cd. *saṁdṛśya saṁdṛśya jaghāna sarvēn-*
driyaṁ na rōṣēṇa tapō rarakṣa ||

The MSS. have *sarvvāndriyaṁ*. This has been changed by Prof. Hultzsch to *sarpān svīyaṁ* but *sarpān priyaṁ* (viz. *tapaḥ*) would appear to be more in keeping with the reading of the MSS.

46 c. *dhiyā ca sārēṇa ca durbalaḥ sa*
(*priyām apaśyan kim u viklavō 'ham* ||)

Read *san* as e. g. in XVIII, 68 c.

Canto VIII.

25 d. *na rataṁ na vidyatē* ||

The MSS. have *na ratinnivintē* which points rather to *na ratir na vidyatē*, the more as it is *rati* and *abhirati* but not *rata* that is found in the immediately preceding stanzas.

34 d. (*praviśanti ca yac camūmukhaṁ*)
rabhasā tatra nimittam aṅganā ||

Prof. Hultzsch remarks that we ought rather to read *aṅganāḥ* and he is doubtless right. But it is no less sure that *rabhasās tatra* as given by the MSS. is perfectly correct and should not have been changed by the editor. The adjective *rabhasa* is found VIII, 61 b; XV, 61 c.

42 c. *api bibhrati nāiva yantraṇā*

Read : *cāiva*.

47. *atha sūkṣmamatiḥ priyāśayā*
laghutā sā hṛdayaṁ na paśyasi |
kim u kāyam asadgṛhaṁ sravat
vanitānāñcaritaṁ na paśyasi ||

laghutā sā has been corrected to *laghu tāsāṁ* by Prof. Hultzsch. *caritaṁ* is a conjectural reading of the editor's. The MSS. have *vrataṁ* or *crataṁ*. It is true that *caritaṁ* reminds one of *vratam*, but it is no less true that both of them are out of place here. Some adjective qualifying *kāyam* and synonymous with *laghu* is

clearly wanted; *calanaṁ* (or *capalaṁ*?) would probably do. Cp. *śarīraṁ calam* IX, 40 a or *śarīram adhruvam* IX, 42 a.

48 a. *yad ahany ahani pradhāvanāir*
(vasanāiś cābharaṇāiś ca saṁskṛtam |)

pradhāvanāir being wholly unintelligible I should like to read: *prasādhanāir*.

59 b. *bhāikṣyaṁ caran dhṛtadhanuś calacittamāuliḥ* |

Read: *calacitramāuliḥ* and cp. IX, 25 a. *citta* and *citra* often interchange in Sanskrit MSS.

Canto IX.

5 d. *na tathā ca budhyasē* ||

Read: *na tathāvabudhyasē* as shown by the close parallelism of ab and cd. The use of *ca* is rather clumsy.

8 b. *yadāpy anarthāir upanīyatē jagat* |
(jalaṁ śucāu māsa ivārkaraśmibhiḥ)

upamīyatē seems more to the point as it corresponds much more closely to *kṣayaṁ vrajēt*, d; cp. I, 15 b d; II, 36 d.

9 d. *balānvitō 'smīti kathaṁ vihanyasē* ||

vihanyasē is decidedly false; *va* and *ha* not seldom occurring for each other in our MSS., it ought, in all probability, to be corrected to *hi manyasē*, cp. *manyasē* 8 d and especially *balānvitō 'smīti na mantum arhasi* 16 b. But *vikatthasē* might, perhaps, be thought of.

12 b. *(yadāmbubhūvāyvanalāś ca dhātavaḥ)*
sadā [ni]ruddhā viṣamā ivōragāḥ |
(bhavanty anarthāya)

Not *ni* but *vi* has to be supplied. The different constituents of the body are opposed to one another even as a crowd of angry snakes. The tertium comparationis should be sought in the mutual hostility (*viruddha* = *viṣama*) of different elements and snakes respectively. Besides, a disease (*rōga*, d) is reputed to arise from the mutual opposition and want of equilibrium between the constituent elements of the body (*dhātuvirōdhāt*).

13 c. *kēcic ca kaṁcic ca daśanti pannagāḥ*
(sadā 'ca sarvaṁ ca tudanti dhātavaḥ ||)

kēcic ca spoils the metre (Vaṁśastha). Read: *kadā ca* which makes the parallelism betwen c and d complete.

22 a. *balaṁ mahad vā yadi yēna manyasē*
(kuruṣva yuddhaṁ saha tāvad indriyāiḥ |)

This can only mean: 'Or, if therefore you think that strength is great'. But *yadi yēna* is stylistically very hard and the simultanuous use of *vā* and *yēna* in one and the same stanza is harder yet. Now, what the poet wanted to say is: 'Or, if you consider yourself very strong, then indeed (make good use of your strength and) wage war with your senses'. In Sanskrit: *balaṁ mahad vā yadi tē ca manyasē*, cp. *ahaṁ vapuṣmān iti yac ca manyasē*, infra, 24 a.

25 ab. *yathā mayūraś calacitracandrakō*
bibharti rūpaṁ guṇavat svabhāvataḥ |

Cp. Buddhacar. IX, 52 and Jātaka-Mālā XXIII v. 17 (p. 146). The words *citra* and *svabhāva* (or their derivatives) are common to all three works.

28 d. *jalaṁ nadīnāṁ ca nṝṇāṁ ca yāuvanam ||*

Read: *nṛṇāṁ ca* in order to suit the metre.

34. *idaṁ viditvā [vi]nidhatsva dāiśikaṁ*
jarābhidhānaṁ jagatō mahad bhayam |
ahaṁ vapuṣmān karavān yuvēti vā
na māna[m ā]rōḍhum anāryam arhasi ||

a. — I read: *vidhivat svadāihikaṁ*. c. — *karavān* is extremely flat. I think we ought to read *balavān*. Cp. e. g. *mattō balarūpayāuvanāiḥ*, supra 30 c, 2 c etc. The triad 'youth, beauty and strength (not: hands!)' is very often mentioned by Buddhist authors.

38 a. *yathā prajābhyaḥ kunṛpō balād balī*
(haraty aśēṣam)

balī is pleonastic. I suppose *baliṁ*. Many a similar passage is found both in this poem and in the Buddhacar. Extorting illegal duties is the chief characteristic of a bad king with our poet.

46 d. *(anarthamūlā viṣayāś ca kēvalā)*
nanu prahēyā viṣayā yathārayaḥ ||

The repeated use of *viṣayāḥ* is rather clumsy. I read: *viṣamā yathārayaḥ*. This slight correction rendered necessary by the parallelism

of the two parts of the simile (*anarthamūlā viṣayāḥ* = *viṣamā arayaḥ*) is tested by the next stanza, infra 47, where *ripavō vadhātmakāḥ* corresponds with *duḥkhahetavō kāmāḥ*.

49 b. *vimōkṣadharmō hy upasaṁhitaṁ hitam* |
vimōkṣadharmābhyupasaṁhitaṁ? cf. supra, 32 d.

Canto X.

2 c. *sa hrīmatē hrīvitatō jagāda*

I read *hrīvigatō* 'shameless'.

11 d. (*chēttuṁ vilagnaṁ na śaśāka bālaṁ*)
kulōdgataḥ prītim ivāryavṛttaḥ ||

kulōdgatāṁ appears to be the genuine reading. *kulōdgataḥ* as an attribute of *āryavṛttaḥ* is rather pleonastic. *kulōdgatā prītiḥ* means probably 'the hereditary friendship' not likely to be given up by noble-minded men. Cp. Buddhacar. XI, 3.

29 a. *citrāiḥ suvarṇacchadanāis tathānyāiḥ*
(*vāidūryanīlāir nayanāiḥ prasannāiḥ* |
vihaṅgamā śiñjirikābhidhānāḥ)

Read: *tathānyē* and cp. *rōciṣṇavō nāma patatriṇō 'nyē*, infra 31 a.

32 b. *nirārtayō.*

54 c. *asūn vimōkṣāmi vimuktamānasaḥ.*

I prefer to read: *vimuktamānasa.*

56 c. *mumōha Vōḍhō[r hi] calātmanō manō*
(*babhūva dhīmāṁś ca sa Śantanus tanuḥ* ||)

Read: *hy acalātmanō*. Buddha does not speak of Madana's victory over light-hearted men but mentions two difficult cases viz. Kāma's triumphs over Vōḍhu and Śaṁtanu who are styled *acalātman* and *dhīmant* respectively.

57 b. *yathā na yāyī (mī) bahusaṁdiśaṁ diśam* |

Read: *yāyāṁ.*

62 b. *kadācid vilabhēta vā na vā* |

In my opinion *kadācid dhi labhēta* is preferable. *vi* for *hi* is not uncommon in our MSS.

63 b. (*tad apramattō niyamē samudyatō*)
ramasva yady apsarasō 'bhilipsasē |

ramasva cannot be possibly good, Nanda being on the contrary advised to shun the pleasures of love if he care for the apsarases in the next world. Shall we read: *carasva* (viz. *niyamē*)? Cp. XI, 2 cd.

Canto XI.

7 c. *vītarāga ivātasthāu*

It is not easy to explain the prefix *ā-* in *ātasthāu*. Either *iva tasthāu* or, less probably, *ābabhāu* would seem to be preferable.

13 a. *duṣkaraṁ sādhanāryēṇa*

This is apparently wrong. Read: *sādhv anāryēṇa* as shown by the other pādas of this ślōka.

18 cd. *tvacchrēyō hi vivakṣā mē*
yatē nārhāmy upēkṣitum ||

Prof. Hultzsch is probably right in reading *yatō nārhasy* but the first pāda should be left unchanged, *vivakṣā mē* (*asti*) being a construction often met with in our poem, cp. VIII, 11 ab (*ata ēva ca mē viśēṣataḥ pravivakṣā*); V, 40 b; XVI, 25 c; XVIII, 2 d; 33 c.

25 a. *titāḍayiṣayā dṛṣṭō*
(*yathā mēṣō 'pasarpati* |)

Read: *duṣṭō*.

35 c. Read together: *yatratatrasthas*.

36 d. (*taṁ tarṣaṁ chinddhi duḥkhaṁ hi*)
tṛṣṇā nāsti ca nāsti ca ||

Read: *tṛṣṇā cāsti* 'for pain and (*ca*) thirst come together into existence and vanish away together (*asti ca nāsti ca*)'.

51 d. *dēvāntasukhasēvinām* ||

Read: *dēvatva°*.

52 d. *ratir bhavati nāśanī* ||

nāśanī (transitive) is at any rate wrong, but *rati*, too, does not seem satisfactory. I should like to read: *matir bhavati nāśinī*. It is not 'the pleasure (of the celestials falling down on earth that)

becomes destroying' but their superior 'understanding is disappearing', their superhuman 'intelligence is fading away'. Cp. the numerous cases of *vidyābhraṣṭā vidyādharāḥ* in Indian folk-lore. *mati* and *rati* are liable to be substituted for each other by the copyists.

54 c. (*sukham utpadyatē yac ca*
divi kāmān upāśnatām |)
ta(*ya*)*cca duḥkhaṁ nipatatāṁ*
(*duḥkham ēvāvaśiṣyatē* ||)

I cannot understand why the editor has changed *yac ca* to *tac ca*. It is true that in prose one would perhaps expect *tayōḥ* after *nipatatām* but a poet is never so accurate and such as it is the construction must be called wholly correct. The 'piṇḍitārtha' of our stanza is this 'The pain of celestials falling down on earth does not balance the pleasures enjoyed by them in heaven: it weighs heavier'. *yac ca* [1] — *yac ca* [2], (*tayōḥ*) — [2]*avaśiṣyatē.*

62 b. Correct: *bhrāmyamāṇaṁ.*

Canto XII.

9. *babhūva sa hi saṁvēgaḥ śrēyasas tasya vṛddhayē* |
dhātōr adhir ivākhyātē paṭhitō 'kṣaracintakāiḥ ||

I am unable to restore c in a satisfactory manner. Nevertheless the true purport of the simile seems to me unquestionable. The tertium comparationis is the word *vṛddhi* which, as applied to *dhātu*, must have the value of the well-known grammatical term (the second vowel gradation). The meaning of cd is therefore probably: as the vowel *a* added twice to a verbal root causes its *vṛddhi.* I am not persuaded by Prof. Hultzsch's remarks concerning this verse.

10. Here, too, Prof. Hultzsch's remarks are no doubt very keen but yet cannot be approved of. What is the clue of this peculiar simile?

20 a. *ciram unmārgavihato*

I should like to read °*vihṛtō.* Cp. *hṛta* for *hata* (Hultzsch) VI, 49 b.

26 a. *anarhasaṁsārabhayaṁ* (*mānārhaṁ tē cikīrṣitam* |)

I surmise: *anarhaṁ saṁ°.*

26 d. Separate: *dharmōnmukha parāṅmukhaḥ* ||

27 d. *pathikēna pipāsunā* ||

iva being necessarily wanted I suppose *pānthēnēva*. Cp. the next two verses.

36 b. I should rather separate: *śraddhā viśēṣataḥ* ('quite especially').

Canto XIII.

15 a. *prāṇidhāṇyadhanādīnām*

I suppose: *prāṇighāta°*.

17 a. I am unable to make out the sense of *yathā* in this verse. *tathā*?

19 d. (*ētāvac chīlam ity uktaṁ ācārō 'yaṁ samāsataḥ* |
asya nāśēna nāiva syāt) *pravrajyā na iha sthitā* ||

The words *na iha sthitā* are most suspected. I surmise *na gṛhasthatā*. Neither monks nor house-holders can do without good conduct.

24 a. *kāyamanasōḥ* seems better.

31 b. (*bhētavyaṁ na tathā śatrōr*) *nākhēr nāhēr na cāśanēḥ* |
(*indriyēbhyō yathā svēbhyas tāir ajasraṁ hi hanyatē* ||)

Prof. Hultzsch should like to read *nākhōr*. But rats do not, as a rule, kill men. In fact, they are rather inoffensive animals though no doubt very troublesome. I read: *nāgnēr*. The following is a parallel stanza from the Buddhacar. (XI, 8) which can be said to settle the question:

nāśīviṣēbhyō hi tathā bibhēmi
nāivāśanibhyō gaganāc cyutēbhyaḥ |
na pāvakēbhyō 'nilasaṁhitēbhyō
yathā bhayaṁ mē viṣayēbhya ēbhyaḥ ||

52 b. (*dṛṣṭvāikaṁ rūpam anyō hi*) *rajyatē 'nyaḥ prahṛṣyati* |
(*kaścid bhavati madhyasthas tatrāivānyō ghṛṇāyatē* ||)

rajyatē cannot be possibly good for, as shown by *bhavati madhyasthaḥ*, a verb opposed to *prahṛṣyati* is wanted. I suppose *rujyatē* 'is afflicted'.

Canto XIV.

12 b. *rathākṣō 'bhyuhyatē yathā* |

Read: *'bhyukṣyatē*. No carriage can go unless the axes be greased from time to time.

16 c, 17 c. Prof. Hultzsch is, in my opinion, wrong in maintaining that *yāvat* 'as long as' governs the Instrumental in these two instances. *yāvat tu* has the value of an adversative conjunction (= *paraṁ tu*) just as *kēvalam* in v. 18 which is exactly parallel. Translate: 'not that he love it, but just (*yāvat tu*) because he wants to—'

34 c. *bhūyō yōgaṁ manaḥśuddhāu kurvīta niyatēndriyaḥ* ||

But the mind of the monk in question is not yet purified. I should prefer *manaḥśuddhyāi*, cp. XV, 69 c and my note thereto.

35 ab. *athāsanagata[ā]sthā na prēkṣitavyā hṛtādiṣu* |

This is sheer nonsense. And yet the MSS. are quite correct. We only need to read the whole as a compound:

athâsana-gata-sthāna-prēkṣita-vyāhṛtâdiṣu |

i. e. *sarvāsv avasthāsu*, infra, 37 c.

45 b. *tasmāc carañ carō 'smīti sthitō 'smīti ca tiṣṭhataḥ* |

tiṣṭhataḥ is of course false. A Nominative being wanted I should like to read: *tasthivān*. Cp. *tasthuṣaḥ* (= *sthitān*) I, 44 b; *punar upavivēśa tasthivān* III, 22 b (a pretty close parallel).

Canto XV.

15 d. (*āryaḥ kō duḥkham aparaṁ*) *saghṛṇō dhātum arhati* |

The whole section where this stanza occurs treating of the *manas*, I should prefer the more pregnant *dhyātum*. The words *dhyātum arhasi* are found in the same position at the end of a line, infra, 19 b.

22 ab. *manaḥ karmasu vikṣēpyam api vā vastum arhasi* |

The whole of this line seems corrupt. At any rate b is. The reading *vāgvastum* (MS.) points rather to *vābhyastum* than to *vā vastum*.

55 c. *svasthāśā jīvitāśā vā*

svāsthyāśā?

69 c. *manaḥ śuddhaṁ bhikṣur vaśagatam abhijñāsv api tathā (yathēcchaṁ yatrēcchaṁ śamayati manaḥ prērayatī ca ||)*

The repeated use of *manaḥ* is extremely hard. Shall we read: *manaḥśuddhyāi?* The Buddhist monk subdues (*śamayati*) his mind (*manaḥ*) in order to purify it (*manaḥśuddhyāi*). Cp. XIV, 34 c and my note thereto.

Canto XVI.

4 c. *duḥkhakṣayō niḥśaraṇātmakō 'yam*

niḥsaraṇātmakō is preferable. I am not sure whether the same correction should be made in XVII, 15 c.

12 b, 13 b. *āuṣṇyam, uṣṇa°* — It is little probable that Aśvaghōṣa should have used two different forms of the same abstract in two consecutive verses. As *uṣṇam* is found in XVII, 22 a and in Buddhacar. IX, 47 c, *āuṣṇyam* is probably no more than a would-be correction of a conscientious scribe.

14 d. *duḥkhaṁ tathā nāgatam apy avāihi* ||

Read together: *tathānāgatam* i. e. *tathā anāgatam* the latter being the standing word for 'future' often used in this connexion. It corresponds with *atītam* b just as in v. 23 bd, infra.

18 a. *ēnēna kāraṇēna* looks very suspected. Shall we read *ētēna*?

19 b. *yānāsanādir bhavati prayōgaḥ* |

This may or may not be the genuine reading. *°ādēr* is at any rate more usual. Cp. the not quite dissimilar case, infra, 58 cd.

33 a. *nyāyēna satyābhigamāya yuktā* (*samyak smṛtiḥ* etc.)

satyādhigamāya is no doubt preferable. Cp. supra, 30 a and infra, 85 a (*tad āryasatyādhigamāya pūrvam* etc.)

34 d. *dōṣā*) *manaḥ salajjā iva dharṣayanti* ||

This looks strange. I should like to read *varjayanti* as the enemy can make a shameful retreat but is never seen to 'attack as if ashamed'. *dharṣayanti* is due to the mechanical influence of the same word, 35 c. *va* for *dha* MS. ad 43 d, *vivarjjayati* for *vitarkayati* MS. ad XV, 18 b.

38 a. *asyōpacāraṁ dhṛtir ārjavaṁ ca*

As the Accusative *upacāram* does not depend on any verb, it must be changed to *upacārō*.

44 d, 45 a. *nandī°* is probably but a slip of the pen for *nāndī°* which yields a better meaning and is used elsewhere. cp. IV, 6 b; 8 b; V, 6 d.

47 b. *śīghraṁ cakāssvāsravasaṁkṣayāya* |

cakāssva is unintelligible to me. Shall we read *carasva* or *yatasva*?

59 a. *rāgōddhatavyākulitē 'pi cittē*

I should like to read: *rāgōddhava°*. Cp. 54 b, 57 b, 60 a, 62 a.

66 b. *jalaṁ kṣipan* seems better on account of *pariprōkṣayatē jalēna*, supra, 65 c.

84 a. *kim atra citraṁ yadi*

Repeated by Kālidāsa in the same position at the beginning of a stanza, Raghuv. V, 33 a.

86 c. (*ētāny araṇyāny abhitaḥ śivāni*
yōgānukūlāny ajanēritāni |)
kāyasya kṛtvā pravivēkamātraṁ
(*klēśaprahāṇāya bhajasva mārgam* ||)

I read *pravivēkam atra* i. e. *ētēṣv araṇyēṣu* (cp. pāda a).

91 b. *Kāundēya-Kāpya-Bhṛgu-Kuṇṭhadhānāḥ* |

As Prof. Hultzsch remarks the metre is destroyed here. It can be easily restored by reading:

Kāundēya-Kāpyāu Bhṛgu-Kuṇṭhadhānāu |

92 d. (*tataḥ padaṁ prāpsyasi tāir avāptaṁ*)
saṁkhyāṁ ca tāis tvanniyataṁ yaśaś ca ||

Read probably: *saṁkhyāṁ ca tāṁ tanniyataṁ yaśaś ca*; but *tēṣāṁ niyataṁ* is likewise possible.

93 d. *tasyārthasiddhyāi madhurō vipākaḥ* ||

I read *°siddhāu*. Cp. my notes to XIV, 34 c and XV, 69 c.

98. *kṛṣṭvā gāṁ paripālya ca śramaśatāir aśnāti sasyaśriyaṁ*
yatnēna pravigāhya sāgarajalaṁ ratnaśriyā krīḍati |
śatrūṇām avadhūya vīryam iṣubhir bhuṅktē narēndraḥ [*śriyaṁ*
tad vīryaṁ kuru śāntayē viniyataṁ vīryaṁ hi sarvarddhayē ||

a. — *aśṇōti* looks more probable as the crops cannot be eaten (*aśnāti*) without further ceremony. c. — Read *narēndraśriyaṁ* in agreement with the first two pādas (no subject, *śrī* qualified throughout).

Canto XVII.

5 c. *jñānēna lōkyēna śamēna cāiva*

I cannot be persuaded of *lōkyēna* being the proper word wanted in this connexion. Read perhaps: *śīlēna.*

16 a. Separate: *sa rūpiṇaṁ.*

19 c. *duḥkhapratīkāravidhāu sukhākhyam*

Either *sukhākhyā* (viz. *bhavati*) or *sukhākhyē* (viz. *sati*) would seem preferable to the reading of the text.

21. *yasmān nirīhaṁ jagad asvatantraṁ*
nāiśvaryam ēkaḥ kurutē kriyāsu |
tat tat pratītya prabhavanti bhāvā
nirātmakaṁ tēna vivēda lōkam ||

I should have preferred in b the reading of the younger MS. viz. *ēkam.* 'Since the world, indolent and dependent as it is, does not exercise one paramount power over actions, but (different) conditions arise from different causes, he concluded that the world is void of ego'.

24 a. *bōdhyaṅgaśitāttaśastraḥ*

Mark the irregular position of °*ātta*°, metri causa.

26 c. *mithyāṅganāgāṁś ca tathāṅganāgāir* (*vinirdudhāva.*

Can *tathā*° in composition mean 'true' as opposed to *mithyā* and would not *sadaṅga*° be preferable? For a similar correction see my note to I, 31 c.

28 c. *pratyātmikāc cāpi viśēṣalābhāt*

A slip of the pen for *pratyātmakāc*?

30 c. *jñānāśrayaṁ prītim upājagāma*

I prefer to read *jñānāśrayāṁ* qualifying *prītim.*

34 b. *tathāgataṁ tattvavid āryatattvaḥ* |

āryatattvam is recommended by good style.

35 c. *vaktrē ghṛṇāklēśavijṛmbhitēṣōr*
(mṛtyōr na tatrāsa na durgatibhyaḥ ||)

vaktrād is perhaps more appropriate.

46 b. *bādhāṁ yathā saṁjanayanti śabdāḥ* |

The feminine *bādhā* is no doubt more usual than the masculine *bādha*, but yet ought we not to read *bādhaṁ* in view of the correspondence between *bādhāṁ yathā* b and *bādhāya tathā* c?

52 b. *mēnē paraṁ śāntim aniñjam ēva* |

I should read *śāntam* 'he thought motionless tranquillity to be supreme'. If *aniñja* can be considered a substantive then *parāṁ* is the necessary correction (cp. 70 a) 'he thought that freedom from motion is the highest tranquillity'. But I don't believe it.

56 c. *mitraṁ balavantam*

Very odd.

Canto XVIII.

2 ab. *draṣṭuṁ mukhaṁ jñānasamādhikālē*
gurur hi śiṣyasya gurōś ca śiṣyoḥ |

This is unintelligible. Luckily enough, the Buddhacarita has a parallel line that enables us to restore the original construction. It runs:

nanu nāiva kṣamaṁ draṣṭuṁ narāḥ strīṇāṁ nṛṇāṁ striyaḥ ||
IV. 95 cd.

It is thus clear that *mukhaṁ* must be changed to *sukhaṁ* [1]. *samādhi* is only a slip of the pen for *samāpti*, cp. *samāpta*, paper MS. (which, by the bye, is perhaps correct). The whole line must run:

draṣṭum sukhaṁ jñānasamāptikālē
gurur hi śiṣyasya gurōś ca śiṣyaḥ |

The pupil is glad to see the teacher to return him thanks for his instruction of many years but the teacher too is glad to meet once more the pupil to offer him his congratulations. The instances from Aśvaghōṣa quoted above are a valuable enrichment of Speyer's

[1]) Or to *kṣamaṁ*? In which case *sukhaṁ* would be a gloss.

materials, Sanskrit Syntax §§ 388, 389 where the syntax of *śakyam*, *yuktam* and *nyāyyam* is treated. A third instance can be added to there viz.

adyōpadēṣṭuṁ tava y u k t a r ū p a ṁ *Śuddhōdanō mē nṛpatiḥ pitēti*, infra 31 ab.

10 d. *lōkē prabhūtō 'smi na lōkadharmā* ||

I should like to read *prasūtō* 'though born into this world I am free from its attributes'. It may be granted that *prabhūta* can mean 'come forth'; practically, however, it is misleading because of the sense of 'abundant, numerous' which it has acquired.

11 d. (*tavāsmi gāṁ sādhu nipīya tṛptas*)
tṛṣēva gām uttamavatsavarṇaḥ ||

ₒvarṇām is preferable. *tṛṣā* is of course Instr.

14 b. *nātmānam urvyādiṣu tēṣu kiṁcit* (viz. *vēdmi*, c) ||

I read *kaṁcit* 'I know that there is n o e g o in these (elements viz.) earth and the others'.

17 c. Can *vivaddham* be a printer's error for *vivṛddham*? But the whole of this line is somewhat clumsy and looks suspected.

27 d. *kūrmē yugacchidra ivārṇavasthaḥ* |

Read perhaps: *kūrmō yugacchit sa.*

36 b. (*unmīlitasyāpi janasya madhyē*)
nimīlitasyāpi tathāiva cakṣuḥ |

nimīlitaṁ and *tavāiva* appear to be sure emendations. *syāpi* is due to the negligence of the scribe who was misled by the first pāda. Shall we read *vāsti* (cp. *tavāiva vēyaṁ*, infra 52 b) or *cāsti*? Cp. *yasyāṁ jāgrati bhūtāni sā niśā paśyatō munēḥ*, Bhagavadgītā, II, 69.

46 c. *svādhīnam adhyātmasukham*

svā° spoils the metre. Read perhaps *svadhītam* 'well learned'.

51 b. *upaśāntamānasaḥ* is perhaps preferable to *°mānasam.*

51 c. *ca* being superfluous read *tathāvabudhyasē*, cp. my note to IX, 5 d.

56 a. *ihōttamēbhyō 'pi mataḥ subhūmō*

I cannot admit the correction proposed by Prof. Hultzsch viz. *sa bhūtalē* and read *sa tūttamō.*

58. *bravītu tāvat puri vismito janas*
tvayi sthitē kurvati dharmadēśanāḥ |
ahō batāścaryam idaṁ vimuktayē
karōti rāgī yad ayaṁ kathām iti ||

idam in c is of course no grave error but I am not aware that *āścaryam* when used as an interjection can be construed with it. The usual idiom is *āścaryam*! or *ahō batāścaryam*! So I should like to propose a slight correction viz. *imām* (*kathām*). 'Just let the inhabitants of the town be astonished and speak while you are delivering sermons: Oh, wonder! that it be even he, that amorous youth, who is preaching this sermon (conducive) to final emancipation!' Not sure.

63. This stanza, rather misunderstood by the editor (Preface p. XI), has been correctly translated by Prof. Hultzsch. It is most interesting to state that the simile it contains is found in Western literatures too. Aśvaghōṣa was a serious man who cared very little for poetry and the like. And so he feels obliged to make an apology to his readers for the weakness in which he indulged: To be sure, I know — but who will hear to reason? men are so very much like little children! It is of an absolute necessity to comply with their turn of mind and mix some honey with the medicine in order to make them swallow it! — Now, this is exactly the case of Lucretius, the Roman poet and philosopher. And still more the case of Tasso, a great poet and a fervent catholic whose sad story is too well known to be repeated here. The coincidence is very significant. I do not consider it superfluous to quote in full the two passages in question. Lucretius says:

sed veluti pueris absinthia taetra medentes
cum dare conantur, prius oras, pocula circum,
contingunt mellis dulci flavoque liquore,
ut puerorum aetas improvida ludificetur
labrorum tenus, interea perpotet amarum
absinthi laticem, deceptaque non capiatur,
sed potius tali pacto recreata valescat,
sic ego nunc, quoniam haec ratio plerumque videtur
tristior esse quibus non est tractata, retroque
volgus abhorret ab hac, volui tibi suaviloquenti

carmine Pierio rationem exponere nostram
et quasi musaeo dulci contingere melle.

De rerum natura I, 930—941 = IV, 11—22. (ed. Brieger).

And here are the words of Tasso who, of course, knew the Latin poet:

Sai che là corre il mondo, ove più versi
di sue dolcezze il lusinghier Parnaso;
e che 'l vero condito in molli versi,
i più schivi allettando ha persuaso:
cosi all'egro fanciul porgiamo aspersi
di soavi licor gli orli del vaso:
succhi amari ingannato intanto ei beve,
e dall' inganno suo vita riceve.

Gerusalemme liberata, I 3.

Zakopane 1915 — Wisła 1918.